S. HRG. 99-592

REAUTHORIZATON OF THE FEDERAL FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND SPACE

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE FEDERAL
FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT

FEBRUARY 20, 1986

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
59-605 O WASHINGTON : 1986

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

5261-34

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

JOHN C. DANFORTH, Missouri, *Chairman*

BOB PACKWOOD, Oregon
BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona
NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM, Kansas
LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota
SLADE GORTON, Washington
TED STEVENS, Alaska
BOB KASTEN, Wisconsin
PAUL S. TRIBLE, JR., Virginia

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina
RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana
DANIEL K. INOUYE, Hawaii
WENDELL H. FORD, Kentucky
DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR., Michigan
J. JAMES EXON, Nebraska
ALBERT GORE, JR., Tennessee
JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV, West Virginia

W. ALLEN MOORE, *Chief Counsel and Staff Director*
RALPH B. EVERETT, *Minority Chief Counsel and Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND SPACE

SLADE GORTON, Washington, *Chairman*

BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona
NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM, Kansas
PAUL S. TRIBLE, JR., Virginia

DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR., Michigan
ALBERT GORE, JR., Tennessee
JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV, West Virginia

CONTENTS

LIST OF WITNESSES

	Page
Opening statement by Senator Gorton	1
Becton, Hon. Julius W., Jr., Director, FEMA; accompanied by James P. McNeill, Associate Director, Training and Fire Programs; and Hon. Clyde A. Bragdon, Jr., Administrator, USFA	2
Prepared statements:	
Mr. Becton	8
Mr. McNeill	11
Mr. Bradgon	15
Questions of Senator Gorton and the answers	19
Questions of Senator Hollings and the answers	20
Ely, Robert H., first vice president, International Association of Fire Chiefs; Charles A. Henry, State fire commissioner, Office of Fire Safety Services, Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency; Larry J. Brown, representing the International City Management Association; and Ralph J. Jackson, advocacy program director, Allstate Insurance Company	23
Prepared statements:	
Mr. Ely	26
Mr. Henry	32
Mr. Brown	34
Mr. Jackson	37

ADDITIONAL ARTICLES, LETTERS, AND STATEMENTS

Jones, James E., Jr., senior Washington representative, Alliance of American Insurers, letter	47
Sarbanes, Hon. Paul S., U.S. Senator from Maryland, letter	47

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE FEDERAL FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1986

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND SPACE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:10 p.m., in Room SR-253, Russell Senate Office Building, Hon. Slade Gorton [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

Staff members assigned to this hearing: Chris Ostrom, professional staff member; and Cheryl Wallace, minority staff counsel.

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR GORTON

Senator GORTON. Good afternoon and welcome to this hearing of the Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space of the Senate Commerce Committee.

Fire is a leading cause of death in the United States. We have one of the worst fire records of any country in the industrialized world. The magnitude of the American fire loss is astounding. Just consider for a moment, this country's experience: Every year, we suffer close to 2½ million fires; between 5 and 6 thousand civilian deaths; and close to $7 billion in property damage.

The deaths are disproportionately high among the poor, the elderly and the very young, and of course are highest among firefighters who risk their lives every day to save the lives of others.

In 1974, Congress passed the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act to support the efforts of local communities in preventing and controlling fires. The Federal program focuses on things that local communities cannot do. It collects data on fires, sponsors research into the causes of fire and methods of reducing the damage from fires, and develops programs to educate both firefighters and the general public.

Although the Federal program has never been as extensive or well funded as originally envisioned, it is beginning to show results. The number of fire deaths in the United States is decreasing, but our fire death rate is still several times that of many other countries, and this suggests that there is a great deal more than we can do.

During today's hearing, we will consider the achievements, management and direction of the programs of the U.S. Fire Administration and of the National Fire Academy. In the past few months there have been significant changes in the management and organization of these programs.

We also need to focus on the fiscal year 1987 budget. Funding for these fire programs, as well as most other domestic programs, has been trimmed back in recent years as a result of our efforts to reduce the Federal budget deficit. Now, in the President's budget request for 1987, we are asked to consider a cut of 23 percent in the National Fire Academy, and the outright elimination of the U.S. Fire Administration.

In today's hearing we need to examine the justification behind the President's proposed cuts. Is there no longer a clear Federal role in the nation's effort to reduce fire loss? Is the private sector ready to take on the responsibility which would be shed by the Federal Government? Fire loss is, of course, expensive. It may not be a wise economic decision to eliminate the role played by the U.S. Fire Administration. We just, outside of this building, experienced a dramatic demonstration of the destructive potential of fire and of the use of the U.S. Fire Administration's residential sprinkler program, of which this is one of the heads.

We will now hear for the first time from Mr. Julius Becton, the newly appointed Director of FEMA, and James McNeill, the new Associate Director for Training and Fire Programs. We are pleased to see that Clyde Bragdon, Administrator of the recently reorganized U.S. Fire Administration, is with us today as well.

Robert Ely, a fire chief from my State of Washington, will represent the International Association of Fire Chiefs. Chet Henry, the Pennsylvania State fire commissioner, will tell us how States benefit from and coordinate with the Federal fire program. Larry Brown, the county manager of Arlington, will give us an idea of how the city managers use and rely on Federal fire programs.

Finally, from Ralph Jackson of the Allstate Insurance Company.

I am curious to learn how the Federal fire effort is perceived by this country's second largest property and casualty insurance company.

At this point, Mr. Becton, as I already said, we certainly welcome you here. We are delighted to have you for your first presentation in this position, and we are happy to welcome your two associates with you at the same time.

STATEMENT OF HON. JULIUS W. BECTON, JR., DIRECTOR, FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY; ACCOMPANIED BY JAMES P. McNEILL, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, TRAINING AND FIRE PROGRAMS; AND HON. CLYDE A. BRAGDON, JR., ADMINISTRATOR, U.S. FIRE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BECTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are delighted to be here. As you said, this is my first opportunity to appear before the committee in my role as Director of FEMA.

We would like to provide our prepared statements for the record in the essence of time, so we could have more time devoted to the questions you may have. So all three of us are prepared to provide those statements.

Senator GORTON. That will be wonderful. The prepared written statements of each one of you will be included in the record.

Unfortunatley, due to an emergency, the members of the subcommittee do have another meeting at 3 o'clock, so we would like as much time to question you as possible. So if you would like to summarize or whatever, go right ahead.

Mr. BECTON. I would like to give a brief opening statement that might set the tone.

My first 105 days—and this is my 105th day as the Director of FEMA—certainly have not been very dull. A great deal of my time has been spent with budgetary matters, interspersed with natural disasters in the States of Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York and your State of Washington.

I have had a chance to visit all 10 regions, completing my tenth region on my 91st day. I promised to do it in the first 3 months. And we have had a variety of other things with which we are faced with, such as 258 court cases in litigation, some 15 GAO audits that involve FEMA, and some 30 audits and reviews that FEMA's Inspector General's Office is faced with.

All that notwithstanding, based upon my personal observations and all reports, I am proud to report to you, sir, that FEMA is fulfilling its mission to serve the public in time of emergency. My highest priority has been, and will continue to be, one of establishing credibility and integrity within the FEMA family and the competence of the agency. I believe we are on track.

As you know, FEMA is charged with the responsibility of providing central Federal focus in emergency management in the United States. Fire is a critical part of our integrated management system which spans the entire spectrum of emergencies from natural to man-made disasters.

We feel emergency management must be undertaken in partnership with State and local authorities. Also, broad based community and private sector participation and support are equally vital.

Protection against the devastation of fire has been an integral part of our emergency management system, as you so aptly said. Since 1974 this committee has sponsored legislation for the Fire Prevention and Control Act which established the U.S. Fire Administration and also the National Fire Academy.

Let me assure you that in the period since the last hearing when there were several expressions of concern, a significant number of actions have been taken to ensure that FEMA is doing the right thing in terms of contracting and management practice in accordance with the applicable laws and regulations.

I would like to also submit for the record a listing of those positive actions that we have taken to include the 1983 Smith Report, as well as the fact that we are currently looking at an Irving Burton Associates,

Inc. Report that was just received, requested by the National Emergency Training Center to look into the management and efficiency of NETC.

Senator GORTON. We will include those in the record.

[The information referred to follows:]

PROCUREMENT IMPROVEMENTS

FEMA has reviewed its contracting procedures to ensure that all applicable laws and regulations will be followed in future procurements. These procedural reviews are a consequence of at least three (3) major factors. First, Congress has been very active in the procurement legislative field due to many recent procurement abuses and has enacted several major laws to reform the procurement process. Secondly, as a consequence of the increased oversight by the Congress and by various auditors, FEMA has taken many steps to strengthen certain areas of our procurement policies. And thirdly, FEMA has a new management team which has displayed a strong commitment to highly competitive procurement and totally ethical procurement practices.

The following steps have been taken to improve its procurement process since October 1983:

A. On January 11, 1984, the Office of Acquisition Management issued Agency Instruction No. 1610.5, entitled "Procurement Review Board." A copy of this Instruction is attached. The objectives of this Instruction were to ensure that all FEMA procurement would be conducted in accordance with good business practices and would be in support of the goals and objectives of the Agency.

B. On March 29, 1984, FEMA published in the Federal Register, revised procurement regulations to supplement the Federal Acquisition Regulations (copy attached). These new regulations brought FEMA procurement policies into more uniform compliance with government-wide procurement policies.

C. On July 9, 1984, the Office of Acquisition Management issued internal guidance concerning the Federal Acquisition Regulation. Included in this internal guidance is a specific item concerning publicizing procurements. A copy of this guidance, Office Instruction No. 37—Federal Acquisition Circular 84-1—July 9, 1984, is attached. It details the procedures for publicizing proposed procurements and processing noncompetitive requirements.

D. On July 24, 1984, in order to strengthen our coordination of requisitions prior to awards, we issued Office Instruction No. 38, entitled "Requisition Coordination Checklist." A copy of this Office Instruction is attached. This Instruction listed the eleven (11) separate areas of coordination of requisitions prior to making a contract award.

E. On September 21, 1984, the Office of Acquisition Management issued Office Instruction No. 40, Invoice/Voucher Processing, a copy of which is attached. This internal procedure was issued to strengthen our controls over the review of contractor bills and invoices. Every indication is that our policies and practices have improved this policy was implemented.

F. On October 26, 1984, the Office of Acquisition Management issued Office Instruction No. 42—Federal Acquisition Circular 84-3 and 84-4. This Instruction was issued to implement recent changes to the Federal Acquisition Regulations. It should be noted that this Instruction concerns, among other things, noncompetitive procurement procedures. Specifically, Page 2 of the Instruction discussed synopsis procedures that became effective on March 31, 1985, and specifically discussed the sources sought synopsis previously mentioned in the Committee report. It should also be noted that one of the attachments to this Instruction describes a format to use when writing sources sought synopses.

G. On December 21, 1984, the Office of Acquisition Management issued additional guidance on processing vouchers to all contract specialists emphasizing that no contractor should receive special treatment with regard to processing vouchers (a copy of this memorandum is attached). This guidance was issued in response to questions that surfaced during Congressional hearings by the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Science and Technology. All specialists were urged to carry out these very important contract administration responsibilities in the most professional and ethical manner.

H. On January 11, 1985, the Director of FEMA designated that the Chief, Policy and Evaluation Division of the Office of Acquisition Management would be the Agency's Competition Advocate. A copy of this January 11, 1985, directive is attached. In this directive, the Director indicated that he totally supported full and open competition under the Competition in Contracting Act.

I. On February 6, 1985, in anticipation of the Competition in Contracting Act becoming effective April 1, 1985, the Office of Acquisition Management issued a notice to every employee in FEMA concerning the implications of CICA. A copy of this notice called Acquisition By-Line No. 2 is attached. Briefly, this notice was intended to underscore the importance of the Competition in Contracting Act, its intent to

increase competition in procurement, and the notice also described how other than full and open competition could only be conducted under seven (7) legal exemptions.

J. On February 12, 1985, the Office of Acquisition Management issued Office Instruction No. 44, Financial Disclosure. The purpose of this Instruction was to implement policy that all FEMA project officers would now be required to file financial disclosure statements in order to comply with the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 and FEMA's Standards of Conduct Regulations. A copy of this instruction is attached.

K. Shortly after the Competition Advocate position was created, the Competition Advocate established competition goals for each directorate and office within FEMA. A copy of these goals is attached. In each case, a competition goal was set which would either match or increase performance over FY 84.

L. On May 20, 1985, the Office of Acquisition Management issued Office Instruction No. 48 concerning the use of level of effort contracts as an attempt to tighten our controls over the type of contract used very often for service requirements. A copy of this Instruction is attached. The Instruction directed that the term form of contract would be a less preferred type of contract than the completion type which provides the Government with more protection.

M. On August 1, 1985, FEMA issued new procurement rules and published them in the Federal Register as 48 CFR Chapter 44. A copy of these rules are attached. These rules fully implemented the Competition in Contracting Act of 1984 and very specifically codified the establishment of a Competition Advocate.

N. On August 15, 1985, FEMA issued formal guidance to formally implement the Competition in Contracting Act within the Agency. This guidance took the form of a revision to Agency Instruction 1610.5, a copy of which is attached. This instruction describes the responsibilities of the Competition Advocate including the review and approval of all noncompetitive justifications.

O. On August 22, 1985, the Office of Acquisition Management issued further internal guidance on the Competition in Contracting Act. Office Instruction No. 49, a copy of which is attached, was designed to provide very specific guidance to the FEMA contracting community on how to process and obtain the necessary reviews and approvals for noncompetitive procurements under the Competition in Contracting Act.

FEMA has also conducted a review of the competence and training of its contracting officers. Together they have a total of 80 years of contracting experience, or an average of 13.33 years of experience per contracting officer. This is a highly skilled and trained group of contracting officers.

Mr. BECTON. From a standpoint of being up to date just today, we have our Director of Acquisition Management up at Emmitsburg looking into an area of contract that we just heard about from GAO. So we are trying to stay on top of what is happening.

I am here today to ask for the authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1987 of $9,021,000 for the training activities authorized under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act. This includes funds to continue training and renovation programs at Emmitsburg. It does not include funding for a second training facilty at Carson City.

Beginning in fiscal year 1987, students at the NETC will be required to pay their own travel and lodging costs.

The budget calls for elimination of the U.S. Fire Administration in fiscal year 1987.

We are asking State and local governments, the private sector, and volunteer organizations to share in supporting and maintaining their fire safety programs.

Let me state very clearly that elimination of the U.S. Fire Administration does not reflect on the program or the people. With today's budget constraints, all programs have been scrutinized for savings. Likewise, higher cost sharing for students at the Fire Academy

is necessary to reduce Federal expenditures. In no way should these actions be interpreted as a lack of support for our nation's firefighters.

Eliminating programs is not an easy decision, even when it is a necessary one. We feel many Fire Administration programs can and will be continued at the State and local level. We will continue to enhance the quality of the Fire Service training. We are committed to that goal, and to "Stop America From Burning."

Thank you, sir.

Senator GORTON. Thank you.

[The statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. JULIUS W. BECTON, JR., DIRECTOR, FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Mr. Chairman, I am Julius W. Becton, Jr., Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency. With me today are James P. McNeill, Associate Director of Training and Fire Programs, and Clyde A. Bragdon, Jr., Administrator of the U.S. Fire Administration.

I welcome this opportunity to appear before your Subcommittee today. This is the first time I have appeared before the Congress since coming on board as Director of the Agency in November of 1985, so this is a special day for me.

I am proud to report to you that FEMA is fulfilling its mission to serve the public in times of emergency. My highest priority has been to establish the integrity and competency of this agency, as it should be in the Federal family and in the public's perception. I feel we are on track.

FEMA is charged with the responsibility of providing a central federal focus on emergency management in the United States. Fire is a critical part of that focus. We have developed an Integrated Emergency Management System that spans the entire spectrum of emergencies from natural disasters to man-made disasters. It extends through all levels of federal, state and local government, as well as the private sector. Through national guidance, planning, and financial and technical assistance, FEMA's job is to develop programs that will enable states and local communities to do four things: Achieve emergency preparedness; respond to emergencies of all types; recover quickly from emergencies; and prevent emergencies whenever possible.

Emergency management must be undertaken in partnership with state and local authorities, and with broadbased community and private sector participation and support. In the final analysis, the capability for dealing with emergencies, or for preventing them, must of necessity begin at the local level.

Protection against the devastation of fire—in our homes, in our work places and in our public buildings—has been a significant thrust of the Federal government, especially FEMA in FEMA.

This was not always the case. Until recent years, there was no national focus on the magnitude and the cost of the fire problem in the United States. The major fire service organizations and other concerned parties convened a series of meetings in 1969 and 1970 to bring national attention to the fire problem. Their work led to the creation of a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control in 1971. As you know, their report, "America Burning," issued in 1973 put a spotlight on the severity of the fire problem in the United States. Then, in 1974, your Committee sponsored legislation leading to the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act. This Act established the U.S. Fire Administration and the National Fire Academy.

Let me bring you up to date on the organizational structure of FEMA's fire programs. Jame McNeill, as of November 1985, has assumed the duties of Associate Director for Training and Fire Programs, with responsibility for the National Fire Academy and the Emergency Management Institute. He reports directly to me. Clyde Bragdon, Jr., the United States Fire Administrator, has responsibility for fire prevention and control programs, and also reports directly to me.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I could report that the fire problem has been solved. The fire problem has not been solved; however, significant progress has been made. Deaths from fire have declined from 8,800 in 1976 to 6,000 in 1984. On a per capita basis deaths have declined from 41 deaths per million in 1976 to 25 deaths per million in 1984. It is difficult to identify one single factor responsible for these reductions; however, the introduction of smoke detectors, public fire safety awareness programs, and increased training efforts have certainly contributed.

I appear before you today to ask for authorization of appropriations for Fiscal Year 1987 for the training activities authorized under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act. The amount requested is $9,041,000, which is the funding contained in the President's Budget. This includes funds to continue the training of students and maintain the Emmitsburg facility. The budget requires students to begin paying their own travel and lodging costs. The Federal government will continue to pay a significant share of the costs including instructors' salaries, supplies, site administration, utilities, local travel and the like. However, local fire departments may be required to pay for the replacement costs of students while at NETC.

The budget calls for eliminating the United States Fire Administration in 1987. Mr. Chairman, we are asking the state and local governments, the private sector and volunteer organizations to share in supporting and maintaining of the fire safety programs. For example, the "Partnerships in Fire" program provides small grants to local community organizations for local fire prevention activities. This is a

popular program, and worthwhile; however, it could be performed by states and localities without Federal money. This year's request also contains no funding for a second FEMA training facility in Carson City, Nevada.

Let me state very clearly that the elimination of the U.S. Fire Administration does not reflect on the quality of the programs. The higher cost sharing at the National Fire Academy is necessary as another step to reduce Federal expenditures. The reality is such that in today's budget constraints all programs have been scrutinized. In no way should these actions be interpreted as a lack of support for the Nation's firefighters. For over a decade, the U.S. Fire Administration has provided a coordinated federal focus for State and local fire prevention and protection initiatives. Much of our effort has been to build the capacity in communities to sustain fire safety programs. Eliminating programs is not an easy decision, even if it is a necessary one. We feel that many of the programs initiated by the U.S. Fire Administration can and will be continued at the State and local level.

Additional cost sharing at the National Fire Academy will not lessen the excellence of our academic offerings. There may be a change in emphasis from resident course training to more field course offerings. We will continue to enhance the quality of fire service training available to Stop America From Burning. We will meet that goal.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator GORTON. Now, do Mr. McNeill and Mr. Bragdon have separate statements?

Mr. MCNEILL. Yes, sir.

Senator GORTON. Fine. Mr. McNeill.

Mr. MCNEILL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am James McNeill, Associate Director of FEMA's Training and Fire Programs Directorate. It is an honor today to appear before the committee to talk about the National Fire Academy. I am going to do this quickly, with some slides and a very brief video.

[Video shown.]

Fire is a serious problem in the United States. Every day lives and property are lost to fire. Every day the men and women of the Fire Service risk their lives for the common good, and every day the staff and the faculty of the National Fire Academy work to reduce that risk.

National attention was focused on the fire problem, as we know, with the publication of "America Burning" in 1973, and over a decade has passed since then. The Academy was, of course, at that point organized and established to advance the professional development of Fire Service personnel. The site of the National Emergency Training Center was purchased in the spring of 1979. At that time the National Fire Academy was the sole occupant.

The first classes were held in January of 1980 and we have very simple, straightforward goals in these classes:

First, to advance the professionalism at all levels of the Fire Service;

Secondly, to foster cross-fertilization of ideas, experience and knowledge among fire professionals; and

Thirdly, to share the newest technology in firefighting and training.

In only 6 years of operation at the Emmitsburg campus, the National Fire Academy has trained over 210,000 students from every State in the Union. Our training is offered both on campus at the Academy's site in Emmitsburg, and off campus in every State where the students live.

Over 40,000 students have been trained on campus. Here, the curriculum emphasizes executive development for senior officers and command and staff skills for mid-level officers. Courses in arson, hazardous material, fire inspection and enforcement, training and public education are offered for technical specialists.

The Academy has rightly gained an international reputation for excellence. Because of its success, courses are eagerly sought and attendance at the Academy is cherished by most people. Our courses are accredited through the American Council on Education and credits can be transferred to a degree program.

Off campus, nearly 170,000 people have attended programs developed by the National Fire Academy. One of our most successful programs, of course, is train the trainer, wherein we bring State and local personnel to Emmitsburg for instruction, and they in turn return home and train their own departments which increases the outreach program significantly.

Weekend educational opportunities are offered to Fire Service personnel in general subject areas. Volunteer officers who cannot go to longer courses at Emmitsburg account for most of those who go for weekends.

Just this year, the Michigan Firefighters Association paid to fly over 200 fire officers for a weekend training exercise. There are 13 such exercises going on this year.

Through FEMA's Emergency Education Network, we offer classes from space. The Hazardous Materials teleconference, for example, in September of 1985, drew over 45,000 viewers. This year we did three teleconferences. Next year we will do four. Using this technology, all fire departments in the country potentially could have the same access to the same information, with the chance to call in questions to experts.

This, we feel, is a cost-effective way to reach many more people.

We are very proud of our new Executive Fire Officer program which is an intensive, 3-year program for top-level fire officers to develop and expand their managerial effectiveness. Graduates have already moved to some top Fire Service positions in several metropolitan areas.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, no review could be complete without the recognition of the brave men and women of the Fire Service who have died in the line of duty. Every October, at the end of Fire Prevention Week, families and firefighters gather at the National Firefighters Memorial on campus to honor our country's firefighters.

I would extend an invitation to you and the other members of the committee to join us on October 12.

Now I would like to show you a video of actual training at the National Fire Academy.

Well, sir, it is a pleasure to present some scenes of the accomplishments of the National Fire Academy. I will assure you that we will continue to offer excellence in our training program.

Thank you.

[The statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF JAMES P. MCNEILL, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, TRAINING AND FIRE PROGRAMS DIRECTORATE, FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

I am James P. McNeill, Associate Director of FEMA's Training and Fire Programs Directorate.

Mr. Chairman, it is an honor to appear before you today to report on the accomplishments and programs of the National Fire Academy.

Over a decade has passed since the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act became law in October 1974. I would like to review NFA's accomplishments and our goals as we enter the second decade of service to our citizens.

The Federal government purchased the site for the now National Emergency Training Center in the Spring of 1979. At that time, the National Fire Academy was the sole occupant of the site. The first classes were held in January of 1980. This is a remarkable accomplishment when one realizes that the staff was able to develop curricula, hire faculty, provide student facilities and deliver advanced training programs without precedent, all in a few short months.

I was Associate Superintendent for Operations at that time, responsible for preparing the decision package to purchase the site and to plan for its opening.

In only six years of operation at the Emmitsburg campus, the National Fire Academy has provided training to over 210,000 students from every state in the Union. Over 40,000 students from across the country, from 12 foreign nations, and many Federal agencies have been trained on campus at the National Fire Academy. They have attended a variety of courses designed to advance the skills and professional development of fire service personnel and of other persons engaged in fire prevention and control activities. In these six years, the Academy has gained an international reputation as an institution of excellence, whose courses are eagerly sought by students desirous of improving their abilities and enhancing their potential to lessen our Nation's fire problem.

In addition to the "on campus" courses, nearly 170,000 students have attended programs developed by the NFA and delivered in every State throughout the country, including participants in the Academy's teleconferences. This total also includes courses which have been delivered by federal, state, and local trainers who have been trained by the National Fire Academy to train other trainers. Using this successful "Train-the-Trainer" concept, thousands of fire service personnel have been trained since the program began in June of 1982.

Another training opportunity, referred to as our "Open Learning" program, provides fire service personnel the opportunity to continue educational opportunities at the upper college level leading to a Baccalaureate Degree in a Fire Service Curriculum. Over 7,000 students have availed themselves of this opportunity and 2,300 are presently enrolled in the "Open Learning" program.

Organizationally, the Academy has two units, the Resident Programs Division and the Field Programs Division. In Fiscal Year 1985, the Academy was responsible for the delivery of 1,735 offerings to 95,874 students, generating 174,465 student days and 1,239,429 student hours of training activity throughout the United States. This large increase in students reflects the growing size of teleconference participants. The Resident Programs Division in Fiscal Year 1985 was responsible for coordinating 157 individual on-campus and 29 off-campus offerings for 51,777 participants. Our Field Programs Division was responsible for coordinating 1,500 individual off-campus offerings and 59 on-campus offerings for 44,097 participants.

We are also using the latest training techniques and technology to reach students across the nation. For example, through FEMA's Emergency Education Network we presented a teleconference on "Hazardous Materials Incident Scene Safety" in September of 1985 with over 45,000 participants. In this Fiscal Year, we are offering two more teleconferences—one on Fire Service Management and the other on Fire Safety Education. Each teleconference now reaches an estimated audience totaling 100,000–200,000, viewing the show live or through rebroadcast. Mr. Chairman, I cannot begin to tell you how enthusiastically these teleconferences are being received. For the first time, every fire department in the country potentially has access at the same time to the same information and techniques. And the format allows for an extensive live call-in period, so questions can be answered by the experts. In FY 1987, we plan to offer four teleconferences as we continue to reach out to our constituent groups across the country reaching as many as we can economically and yet personally.

The cost of all National Fire Academy programs are shared among the Federal government, state and local governments, the individual students and, in some cases, the private sector. The total Federal cost for the Academy's program in FY1985 was $11,028,000. Our courses are continually updated with the infusion of

new technology and information, and new courses are added each year to our curriculum. Our Master Curriculum Plan, developed in 1984, defines the field of firefighter safety, incident command, community resource preservation and professional development in a sequential manner. It is structured to allow fullest growth and learning potential at each level—Executive Fire Officer, Command and Staff, Fire Service Technical Specialist and Line Officer.

We are particularly proud of our Executive Fire Officer Program course, an intensive three-year program for top-level fire officers which provides opportunities to develop and expand their managerial effectiveness. Graduates have moved to the top fire service positions in Los Angeles, Fort Worth, Philadelphia, Chicago, Palm Beach County, and many other communities.

Because of our conviction that effective delivery of public services in an era of shrinking resources requires a conscious investment aimed at enhancing the quality of management in the public sector, the NFA and the U.S. Fire Administration have entered into an agreement with Harvard University that permits five senior fire service executives to participate in the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard each summer. This prestigious opportunity is another example of the emphasis we are placing on assisting senior fire officers in dealing with the increasingly complex task of delivering effective and efficient public service in a most competitive environment.

NFA courses are accredited through the American Council on Education and NFA credits can be transferred to a degree program.

It is a pleasure to present the accomplishments of our National Fire Academy and to report, with a positive spirit, on our goals for the future. However, budgetary constraints demand that we take a hard look at all of our programs. I can assure you that the National Fire Academy will continue to offer excellence in our training efforts. At the same time, we will examine new delivery systems and technologies that are cost effective. There is a tremendous spirit of public service and dedication among the Nation's firefighters and the citizens who devote their time, lives and energies for the common good. We pledge our efforts at the National Fire Academy to supporting those men and women of the fire service and, ultimately, all the citizens of this country in achieving a Fire Safe America.

Thank you.

Senator GORTON. Mr. Bragdon.

Mr. BRAGDON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Clyde A. Bragdon, Jr., Administrator of the U.S. Fire Administration.

It was some 20 short months ago—and I give emphasis to that "short months" ago—that I appeared before this body in a hearing for my confirmation as Administrator. At that time I observed and identified the means and methods that I felt essential to continue to address and abate this nation's fire problems. And I remain steadfast in that respect, having spent a lifetime of commitment to this effort.

You have requested and we have submitted for the record, major achievements in fiscal year 1985 and a status report and anticipated accomplishments for fiscal year 1986. Included, of course, are our efforts in programs of coordination with State and local governments and the private sector.

I also would like to use some visuals to give just a very brief overview of the some of the program initiatives that the Fire Administration is currently involved in. Certainly this is only a very short tasting of the menu, because we do have a very broad agenda.

[Video shown.]

Mr. BRAGDON. Sir, that was firefighter Terry Bowman of the Portland, OR Fire Department who was seriously injured in that particular fire.

Our point of emphasis here is trifocal. One is certainly discipline; two, training; and through the utilization of proper equipment. The other firefighter that had the similar exposure at the end of that ladder was wearing a Project Fires ensemble, protective firefighter's safety clothing developed by the U.S. Fire Administration in concert with NASA. Certainly we have had excellent cooperation in that effort, Project Fires, with the International Association of Firefighters and 16 fire departments throughout the country that have served in our testing of that program.

These next three, we will see just brief PSAs, Public Service Announcements.

These three PSA's were produced by the National Fire Information Council which does fire data collection throughout the United States. And all three of those celebrities donated their efforts and time.

I might add a little footnote, that Pearlie Mae (Pearl Bailey) was on the scene for some time and they could not get it right with firefighters trying to be actors, and as a professional she squared them away.

I am going to cut that a little short. EENT has been managed programatically by the Fire Administration for the Agency, and we find the teleconferencing has become an outstanding medium for delivering educational and training messages for the FEMA family.

Ed, would you show the Senator, please, the down links that we currently have with utilizing this as a resource capability, that we are able to communicate training-wise and education-wise in those kinds of facilities.

[Charts shown.]

Mr. BRAGDON. In addition to that, we describe what we call bandit facilities. Those are not registered down link sites that are also capturing that information, an outstanding method of communicating.

I am going to move on faster through this video. This next sequence shows us this very same thing that you went through. It is Major General Ballantine at Fort Meyer, where the Army started an initiative of residential sprinklers in some of their quarters, to begin with, and this was a demonstration that was conducted at Fort Meyer.

I might add to that, if they say a picture is worth a thousand words, certainly the demonstration is worth 10,000 words, and I do not really need to go into great depth about the technology and the transfer of that technology because of the residential quick response head.

[Video shown.]

Mr. BRAGDON. Our equipment at FEMA is a little more sophisticated. We have a fast forward, and I actually have one at home as well.

We will try to pick up on that if we could.

There are two others I had, but I am going to stop the tape there because we have a gentleman in the audience who will be on the next panel who will tell you about the "Firehouse Mouse." We have that tape where Pennsylvania has done an outstanding job, and also just to briefly mention, we had a tape of our involvement over the years with Sesame Street, a very excellent method of teaching younger children. That was reinforced to me here over the holidays when we did

programs in Arlington and Fairfax County with the Sesame characters of how 6- and 7-year-olds have become acquainted with fire safety practices through that particular medium.

I have intended only to highlight a select group of projects just to illustrate some of the areas covered by the Fire Administration, and I told you how we would submit a complete list.

In closing, I emphasize my support for the fire program and its initiatives, past and present. However, I must lend an even greater emphasis to the higher priorities that must prevail within the Federal establishment if the economic stability of this nation is to be realized through an aggressive program of balanced budgets and deficit reductions.

I further commit to an orderly closure of USFA fire programs or their transition where appropriate and wherever possible.

I would be remiss if I did not note the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control provided comprehensive guidelines and recommendations in its report "America Burning."

The framers of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act followed these guidelines with a valid action plan. The fire community, the interest groups, and the citizens themselves have worked diligently and collectively to implement change.

A staff, small in numbers, has been big in its dedication and commitment to the goals of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act.

Finally, this committee and Congress have been continually supportive of these efforts. The foregoing represents a partnership that has impacted on this nation's fire problem. They have made a difference.

Thank you.

[The statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. CLYDE A. BRAGDON, JR., ADMINISTRATOR, U.S. FIRE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Chairman, I am Clyde A. Bragdon, Jr., Administrator of the United States Fire Administration. Some short twenty (20) months ago, I appeared before this body in a hearing for my confirmation as Administrator, U.S. Fire Administration. At that time, I observed and identified the means and methods I felt essential to continue to address and abate this Nation's unacceptable fire problem.

Since the reorganization of the U.S. Fire Administration (USFA) in FY1985, we have concentrated our efforts in areas that not only provide a federal fire focus, but we have also given attention to efforts to build capacity at the state and local level and to encouage the participation of the private sector. We feel these programs have been successful.

Fire continue to be a serious National problem. Past USFA efforts, among them the very successful smoke detector campaign and public fire safety awareness program, have helped to reduce the Nation's fire deaths to under 6,000 in 1984. We still, however, continue to annually lose billions of dollars of our National economy to fire each year; in 1984 the amount was over $7 billion.

The U.S. Fire Administration has provided, with strong Congressional and constituency support, a very significant Federal focus on the Nation's fire problems. It has served as a catalyst, a conduit and a clearing house. Its support includes and involves the talent and commitment of the Nation's fire community and its supporters: professional fire organizations; private fire associations; fire departments, large and small, career and volunteer; fire chiefs and firefighters by the legion; and political leadership and decision-makers at the Federal, State and local levels.

The U.S. Fire Administration programs developed in concert with and being implemented by the fire community, the private sector, and interest groups include: the development and promotion of smoke detection equipment; the development and expanded applications of fire and sprinkler technology; community master planning for fire protection; emergency medical service; fire awareness programs through public education; significant fire prevention and arson programs; and fire data collection and analysis.

The Fire Administration is currently organized in functional program areas with the flexibility to adjust to new program needs and mandates. Significant among its FY85–86 initiatives are: the emphasis on developing a strong private public sector partnership in the support and development of community-based organization volunteer fire prevention efforts; the research, demonstration, and promotion of new fire sprinkler technology in residential applications; improved data collection and analysis methodology; protection of the firefighter in his work environment; and programs to make the public more aware of the hazards of fire.

Fire protection in this country was initially founded as a fire suppression system, a reactive response system. Over the years fire protection has become a more proactive system through fire prevention activities and those organizations and individuals who are a part of the fire protection system must be credited with persistence and dedication to the effort to reduce life and property loss. The most effective prevention payoffs through public education and persuasion must be expanded and exploited in a variety of approaches to address all audiences.

The under utilization of the greatest potential resource in fire prevention efforts, the public themselves, must be aggressively pursued for expanded involvement and commitment to fire safety.

To accomplish the objective of greater public awareness, the USFA in FY85 engaged the firm of Oglivy & Mather to assist us with a well coordinated and properly focused public awareness program. The deliverables from Phase I of this project have been received by the Fire Administration within the past week. We are in the process of exercising a second year option with this firm to continue the program.

I would now like to highlight for the Committee a few of the current programs that illustrate our commitment to build capacity at the state and local level and encourage the participation of the private sector.

FIRE DATA AND ANALYSIS

National fire incident reporting system (NFIRS)

With the cooperation and support of the National Fire Information Council (NFIC), the USFA operates the NFIRS program. The program collects accurate fire data from throughout the United States with 38 states and 20 metro areas reporting on a voluntary basis.

Community volunteer fire protection

Congress has strongly supported our effort to increase the scope and effectiveness of local fire prevention through a merger of federal, state and local resource in developing new community prevention, education and protection programs. Grants have been awarded to States in this program (20 and DC to date) who in turn fund local fire prevention projects (61 projects currently).

Residential sprinkler program

The application of quick response sprinkler technology offers a means to dramatically reduce the loss of life and property. Since 1974, USFA has expended considerable resources to support research and encourage the development of quick response residential sprinkler heads. With a significant increase in funds from Congress in FY85, the USFA has been able to extend the application of this technology through additional research, demonstration and information dissemination. Examples are:

Research.—Studies on improvement of installation standards, determining the cost-benefit of installed systems, and conducting local fire tests with installed sprinkler systems, are some of the research projects underway.

Demonstrations.—We have demonstration projects in each of the 10 Federal regions of the country showing the effectiveness of sprinkler systems and local demonstrations of sprinkler retrofit projects.

Information disseminations and technical assistance.—In order to improve public awareness of fire safety we have prepared materials, publications, such as the popular brochure "Ounce of Prevention", held Regional workshops, supported national conferences, and provided technical assistance to communities for their programs.

Public education and awareness

Responding to Congressional interest in expanded public education and awareness, USFA is carrying out a broad based program in support of all USFA programs. In addition, targeted education programs are being carried out starting with two efforts aimed at smoke detector maintenance and residential sprinkler awareness.

Protective clothing

The Fire Administration is actively working with the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) F-23 Committee on Protective Clothing to develop standards for chemical protective clothing for use by the fire service. This is a continuing initiative and complements USFA's participation on the newly formed National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 1971 Subcommittee on Hazardous Materials Protective Clothing.

FIREFIGHTER HEALTH AND SAFETY

Project FIRES (Firefighters Integrated Response Equipment System)

During the past three years, the Fire Administration has been involved in a program to improve the design and performance of structural firefighters protective clothing and equipment. This project has produced and field tested three versions of prototypes aimed at lowering the metabolic load of firefighting without sacrificing protection. Prototypes have been field tested in 14 cities. The next version of NFPA 1971 (standard on protective clothing) for structural firefighting will reflect the research findings of project FIRES.

Northwest firefighter mortality study

The University of Washington Harborview Medical Center is conducting a mortality study of firefighters in the City of Seattle, Washington. This study looks at all causes of deaths that may be associated with changes in fire smoke exposure in recent decades.

Teleconference

In conjunction with FEMA, USFA has funded and provided program management for a number of national teleconferences in arson, residential sprinklers and hazardous materials.

Fire Executive Fellowship Program

We have established, in cooperation with the National Fire Academy, the FEMA Fire Executive Fellowship Program at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government. A national competition is used to select senior fire executives to attend a three-week summer program at Harvard to join with other Senior execu-

tives in State and local government. Sixteen Fellows have been selected over three years. This program is now incorporated into the master curriculum of the NFA.

I have attempted to highlight a select group of projects that serves to illustrate the areas covered by USFA projects.

In closing, I emphasize my support for the fire programs and its initiatives, past and present. However I must lend an even greater emphasis to the higher priorities that must prevail within the Federal establishment if the economic stability of this Nation is to be realized through an aggressive program of balanced budgets and deficit reductions. I further commit to an orderly closure of USFA programs, or their transition wherever possible.

It must be noted that the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control provided comprehensive guidelines in the recommendation of its report "America Burning". The framers of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act followed these guidelines with a valid action plan. The fire community, the interest groups and the citizens themselves have worked diligently and collectively to implement change. A staff small in numbers has been big in its dedication and commitment to the goals of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act. Finally, this Committee and Congress have been continually supportive of these efforts. The foregoing represents a partnership that has impacted the problem and has made a difference.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator GORTON. I am going to have to submit most of my questions to you in writing but, Mr. Becton, I would like to ask you one.

In the event that Congress ignores the recommendation of the Administration to wipe out appropriations for the Fire Administration—and let's say it decides simply to continue funding at 1986 levels—would FEMA advise us basically to continue the current allocation of funds among the various projects, or would it want adjustments to be made?

Mr. BECTON. Mr. Chairman, if the Congress continued the funding of the Fire Administration and did not give an increase in the overall FEMA budget, we would be in the same position that I was in when I first joined 3 months ago, of having to find programs and projects in which to cut——

Senator GORTON. No, no. I am not asking you that question. I am saying we just find that we simply ignore the recommendation to get rid of it and appropriate money for the Fire Administration at the same level as 1986.

I am not at this point taking it out of another program. I am just saying, will you continue the present priorities of the Fire Administration, the same amount of money?

Mr. BECTON. That is correct. We would continue.

Senator GORTON. Thank you

One other quick question for you. What is the current status of the Cigarette Safety Study?

Mr. BRAGDON. May I field that, sir?

I am vice chairman of that Interagency Commission, and we met recently. As you know, Congress did in fiscal year 1986 supply $1 million of funding. Additionally, CPSC along with Health and Human Services, are the other two organizational elements of that effort. CPSC and the Fire Administration through FEMA also provided some additional funding in fiscal year 1985.

When we met the other day, we felt we would be short of the projected dollars necessary to complete the study effort. The direction we gave to the Chairman of our technical study group was that he prioritize within the dollars available the efforts, so we would get the most product for the money that will be expended.

Senator GORTON. When would you expect to finish?

Mr. BRAGDON. Their report was due initially in 30 months, so that that would bring it about a year from this June. July 1987 is when the final report is due to Congress.

Senator GORTON. Thank you.

As I say, we are going to submit more questions to you in writing

Mr. BRAGDON. One addition to that. We are attempting to identify private sector funds to complete that study as well.

Senator GORTON. Great.

[The following information was subsequently received for the record:]

QUESTIONS OF SENATOR GORTON AND THE ANSWERS

Question 1. The Committee is aware that USFA has, in the past, promoted "active systems versus passive systems", specifically sprinkler systems over fire walls. We are told that major building codes contemplate no such trade-off for the 13–D sprinkler system featured in USFA's Community Partnership Against Fire Program. What is USFA's current position on this issue?

Answer 1. Although the Community Partnership Against Fire Program includes some residential sprinkler programs, the Residential Sprinkler Program is essentially a separate initiative. We, in the USFA, are advocates of a total systems concept. At present, trade-offs are at the discretion of the agency having jurisdiction. We envision the local jurisdiction providing: Increased building density; longer distances between hydrants; reduction in the ISO required fire flow; and reduction or elimination of turn around street width for fire apparatus.

Pamphlet 13–D addresses one and two family homes and mobile homes. There is very little to trade off in fire walls in this type of occupancy. We feel that fire walls, under certain conditions, provide a very necessary built-in level of protection and the local authority having jurisdiction should carefully weigh the final results before allowing any significant trade offs.

Question 2. You have stated that proposed cuts in the National Fire Academy student stipend program would require students to pay their own student and lodging expenses. Do you have any estimates of what proportion of students would be unable to attend if they had to pay their own travel and lodging? Have you considered other funding options, such as charging each student a standard tuition fee, then providing stipends to those in need? Do you know if other Federal training programs (e.g. FBI, EPA, Department of Transportation) have student stipends, and if the President has proposed to eliminate them in FY 1987?

Answer 2. No, at the present time we do not have any definitive estimates on the effect of eliminating students stipends and charging for rooms. Informal comments to us by fire officials from around the country indicate that they think there may be as high as a 75% reduction of students from their areas. Based upon our observation of course applications earlier this fiscal year, when we informed all applicants that there might not be stipends available to pay their costs, enrollments dropped about 30% during that period. We will certainly be looking at this situation very closely over the next months. We think it is important to note, however, that we are confident that the student drop-off will be a temporary one, an adjustment period for us as well as the State and local officials. We are convinced that the courses offered at the National Fire Academy are of such a quality that communities will find the means to send their students.

We have not considered other funding options but we will certainly have to consider them now. A "sliding scale" tuition might be on option. Securing private sector funding to supplement travel costs or charging no lodging costs for students west of the Mississippi might be among the options. We want to state again, however, that the need for other funding options, we are convinced, will be temporary only until such time as the local communities have been able to adapt to the new costs.

Yes, some Federal agencies do offer assistance, however, we do not believe that they refer to the assistance as "stipends." In this respect, our programs could be unique since our legislation specifically mentions the term "stipend." Other Federal training assistance has been made available in a variety of ways, including direct grants to local organizations, travel reimbursements, free lodging, and the like. It should be noted that many Federal agencies offer only inter- or intra-Federal agency training only so "stipends" for State and local students is not an issue. In our case, our training is almost totally for State and local personnel. It is our understanding that the elimination of travel stipends is part of a government-wide policy to require more cost-sharing for training by State and local governments and not specifically targeted at the National Fire Academy.

Question 3. Are there currently any problems within NFA or USFA in regard to unfilled positions or a lack of full time employees; and, if so, what action is needed to correct the problem?

Answer 3. The problem within NFA is one of not having sufficient salary funds to cover the vacancies that have occurred over the past two years. The impact of budget reductions, including the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings requirements. We do need additional personnel to more adequately perform our functions but only the influx of salary funds will permit us to fill the authorized positions. Also, as you know, within the Federal Emergency Management Agency overall, funding reductions have caused the initiation of a Reduction in Force (RIF).

The current U.S. Fire Administration organization and level of full-time employees (20) was established in FY 1983 with the reduction and reorganization of the USFA. The FY 1983 program budget of $3.3 million and 20 workyears was approved by Congress and accepted by the Administration. The USFA program budget was increased by $1 million in FY 1984 as a result of an Administration request. Our FY 1985 increase of $4.5 million included and Administration requested increase of $2.5 million and a Congressional add-on of $2 million, bringing the FY 1985 program budget to $8.8 million; however, the workyears remained at the FY 1983 level of 20. The reduction in FY 1986 of the $2 million Congressional add-on in FY 1985, brings the current program to $6.8 million, still twice the $3.3 million in FY 1983 program, but with the original 20 workyears.

With the interest in the USFA expanding its program efforts in residential sprinklers, public fire protection and awareness, firefighter health and safety, and other areas, the USFA finds it increasingly difficult to respond effectively without additional workyears.

QUESTIONS OF SENATOR HOLLINGS AND THE ANSWERS

Question 1. The Administration has proposed to eliminate the USFA for fiscal year 1987. Would the USFA's fire prevention and control activities and programs be sufficiently assumed by State and local governments?

Answer 1. The reality is that most State and local governments do not have the resources necessary to conduct the research, development, and technical programs sponsored by the USFA. Additionally, economies of scale require that these efforts be conducted through a central organization. New technologies and approaches to the fire problem, particularly as the problems continue to evolve, i.e., hazardous materials issues and alternatives fire suppression approaches, require a strong Federal, State, local and private sector partnership. However, the nation's response to fire from an operations and response mode does and should remain with State and local fire services.

Question 2. What programs and activities have had the most significant impact on improving our nation's fire problem? Please list the programs in order of priority.

Answer 2. The USFA has carried out a number of programs which it feels has directly contributed to a reduction of the nation's fire program. In priority order, they are:

Public fire education and awareness.

Technology developments and improvements: Smoke detectors; Residential Sprinklers; Basic Fire Research; Firefighter Tools and Equipment; and Arson Information Management System.

Local Support at Fire Prevention and Arson Control: Master Planning Assistance; Juvenile Firesetter Problems; Arson Mitigation and Awareness; Community Based Organization Programs; and Fire Service Management Improvement Efforts.

National Fire Incident Reporting System: Data Collection, Analysis, and Reports; Training of Local Fire Service Personnel; and Management and Operational Data Applications.

Consensus Codes Program Support.

Question 3. What programs and activities are currently duplicated by those in the private sector or the State and local governments?

Answer 3. The programs of the USFA have been carefully reviewed before they were initiated to ensure against duplicating those efforts being undertaken by private sector or State and local governments. To the best of our knowledge, there is no duplication of effort.

Question 4. On page 5 of the testimony presented by Allstate Insurance Company, Ralph Jackson, Director of Advocacy Programs, notes: "In the absence of intelligent national leadership, there will be duplication of expenses in those States addressing the fire problem." Do you agree with this statement? Please explain.

Answer 4. I agree with Mr. Jackson's statement. We recognize that the direct day-to-day activities of the fire service are a local concern, however, because of the scale of effort and the desire to achieve some degree of standardization, a federal focus on those fire issues is important. Research, collection of data, input to the code process, and coordination of arson programs cannot be as efficiently achieved by individual State and local efforts as it can on the national level.

Question 5. The USFA has concentrated its efforts on further research of the residential sprinkler system and the development of improved protective clothing and equipment for firefighters. Would other research and technological improvements be left solely to the private sector to launch?

Answer 5. The USFA has initiated research in many areas in addition to sprinkler development and improved protective clothing. In cooperation with the Center for Fire Research and Factory Mutual, we have researched fire fuel behavior under realistic conditions and also computer modeling. We are currently researching the effects of toxic gases and cancer producing products of combustion on firefighters with the State of Washington. The effects of stress on the firefighters and other job-related problems are currently being researched. The private sector has not shown an interest in these programs and I doubt if they would pick up such programs.

Question 6. The USFA ensures effective and accurate fire data collection and analysis by working jointly with the National Fire Information Council and several States to help abate America's fire problem. Are fire statistics currently collected and analyzed by any government entity or the private sector? If so, are the statistics reliable?

Answer 6. The USFA implements a comprehensive program of data collection and analysis including the management of the National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS). NFIRS is a cooperative effort between Federal, State, and local authorities to maintain a central data base relating to fires, injuries, fire deaths, locations, property damage, and other important information. Forty States and 21 metropolitan cities voluntarily participate.

The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) conducts an annual survey which is a statistically ranked extrapolation from 3,000 respondents that provide a summary annual data. This approach, however, does not permit identification and analysis of fire cause which is essential for effective fire prevention strategies.

The USFA's NFIRS provides the ability to draw relationships between a wide variety of factors in a single incident, similar incidents producing various effects and comparative analysis. This also allows a scenario identification to support direct intervention strategies by locality, cause, or other factors. This is an extremely reliable, fire incident system. In fact, NFPA relies on the NFIRS data for its fire cause analysis. An important point to make here is that, over the past several years, the USFA and NFPA have drawn on each others strengths in utilizing data. The Consumer Product Safety Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation also rely on USFA produced data to assist in fulfilling their mission requirements.

Question 7. Would the elimination of the USFA have any affect on America's declining rate in fires and fire-related deaths?

Answer 7. This is a difficult question to answer. The presence of the USFA and its effect on the reduction of fire deaths is certainly real, but difficult to quantify. Certainly the efforts put forth in the reduction of fire deaths, i.e., public fire awareness, data collection, smoke detector programs, anti-arson efforts, research, and the residential sprinkler program, all require a national leadership effort and would suffer without such focus. We are confident that some States will continue to carry on programs, however, we will not have the opportunity to replicate these programs in States with weak programs.

Question 8. In the testimony presented by Charles Henry, State Fire Commissioner of Pennsylvania, attachment 14 shows a decline in the number of fire deaths from 1976 to 1984. The testimony further notes that "this decline may not have been possible if it were not for the technical and financial assistance funneled into Pennsylvania from the USFA." If the USFA is terminated, do you feel that States will discontinue fire prevention and control programs due to a lack of funding?

Answer 8. We are not familiar with attachment 14.

Pennsylvania has done a great job in reducing fire deaths in the Commonwealth. We are sure that a progressive State such as Pennsylvania will continue to fund fire prevention programs. What will be lacking, however, is a mechanism that would allow States to benefit from the results of successful programs in other areas. The USFA has functioned as a clearing house for such information and has had success with serving as a catalyst to see that things do happen on the local level. A national focus will be lost that individual States will not be able to replicate. In addition, there are techniques or programs that require national level research and development in order to be utilized at State and local levels.

Question. In your opinion, is the proposed 1987 budget sufficient for the NFA to carry out its statutory responsibilities?

Answer. Yes, the 1987 budget submission is sufficient to carry out the statutory responsibilities of the NFA.

Question. How would termination of the USFA affect the activities of the National Fire Academy?

Answer. The termination of the USFA will affect the activities of the National Fire Academy in two different ways. First, the results of the research conducted by the USFA are incorporated into the educational programs of the Academy. One ex-

ample is the work of sprinkler systems, specifically the residential sprinkler. The second area is the fire data collected under the National Fire Incident Reporting System, which is used in developing or revising courses.

Question. What do local communities pay now for their fire officers and allied professionals to attend the National Fire Academy?

Answer. At the present time, local communities pay the following for their firefighters to attend the National Fire Academy:

1. Meals for the period of training at the rate of $11.00 per day. This equates to $132.00 for a two-week course and $209.00 for a three-week course.

2. Ground transportation between the residence or work location to a common carrier terminal as the point of departure if the individual is travelling by air.

3. The salary and benefits of career personnel while they attend courses.

4. The cost of providing replacement personnel while an officer is attending classes if the department is required to maintain a specified level of manpower on duty. Because of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), this is at time and one-half of the regular salary.

In the case of a volunteer fire officer, the individual will be attending on his/her vacation time and may have to pay their own expenses rather than them being paid by the department.

Question. Who would be hurt by the elimination of transportation stipends to the National Fire Academy?

Answer. The majority of students attending resident courses at Emmitsburg are in a paid, full-time career status. Elimination of transportation stipends will cause an initial impact upon many of the municipal departments that send fire service officers to resident courses. Since these departments operate on a budget cycle that allows for little short-term adjustment, there will be a drop-off in applications for attendance from these departments.

However, we feel that fire department managers and city officials understand the professional quality and value of their communities of attendance at the intensive resident programs. We are confident that they will include funds to cover the cost of attendance for members of their departments in future budget submissions. While attendance may not be as readily attainable, it will also become more competitive and prestigious within the department and the community.

Attendance at NFA's resident programs is of paramount importance to the Nation's fire service officers. The unique quality of the courses and the opportunity to interact with other fire officers from across the country most frequently leads to professional advancement for NFA graduates. This opportunity to enhance career development is what sets the National Fire Academy apart from any other fire service training institution.

Question. Does the National Fire Academy allow other agencies to utilize vacant space on the campus when available? If so, please explain.

Answer. Yes, the National Fire Academy does allow other agencies to utilize vacant space on the campus when it is available. Lodging, meeting space, and related campus services are made available on a space-available basis to organizations whose mission is directly related to the Federal Emergency Management Agency/Training and Fire Programs Directorate mission or to those that qualify under the "Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act of 1976." All such groups are provided such accommodations at the prevailing rates which are based on OMB Circular A–45. Funds are currently deposited into the general receipts of the U.S. Treasury since the Federal Emergency Management Agency/Training and Fire Programs Directorate does not have authorization for a revolving fund.

Question. Under the Administration's proposed budget for fiscal year 1987, would any positions be eliminated? If so, how many?

Answer. Under the proposed NFA budget for FY 1987, no positions would be eliminated. The strength would remain as funded in the FY 1986 appropriations act which is 78 workyears. The current estimate for the U.S. Fire Administration for FY 1986 shows 22 workyears.

Question. How much would professional and volunteer firefighters have to pay for lodging expenses at the Academy under the Administration's FY 1987 budget proposal?

Answer. Before we establish a firm lodging rate for our students, we will be reviewing our fixed costs at Emmitsburg, the funding that will be available to us, student projections, and the like. A very preliminary estimate for the daily room rate for all students would be $20. This cost would compare favorably with comparable facilities surveyed in the Emmitsburg area last October, as well as the rates we understand will be used at the FBI Academy in Quantico, Virginia.

Senator GORTON. We do need now to hear from the panel of Mr. Ely, Mr. Henry, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Ely, we will start with you. I am afraid I have only got about 20 minutes, so I will say to each of you, as I did to the earlier panel, that your entire written testimony will be included in the record as if you had read it. So if you can give me as trenchant a summary of what you have to say as is possible, I would greatly appreciate it.

STATEMENTS OF ROBERT H. ELY, FIRST VICE PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIRE CHIEFS; CHARLES A. HENRY, STATE FIRE COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF FIRE SAFETY SERVICES, PENNSYLVANIA EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY; LARRY J. BROWN, COUNTY MANAGER, ARLINGTON COUNTY, VA, REPRESENTING THE INTERNATIONAL CITY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION; AND RALPH J. JACKSON, ADVOCACY PROGRAM DIRECTOR, ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY

Mr. ELY. I appreciate that. I am Bob Ely. I am chief of the fire department of Kirkland, WA and the building official there, and I am also the first vice president of the International Association of Fire Chiefs.

I want to thank you, Senator, for allowing me to be here and to allow our Association to give our thoughts. I would like to pass along to you briefly some of the frustration that the Fire Chiefs in this country have when we find what seems like every couple of years we get attacked about whether our fire programs are going to be funded or not. And it is a very frustrating feeling.

If you think about what the fire departments in every community does, we not only fight fires but we are called to floods, we are called to earthquake damages, we respond to hazardous materials spills on the highways and the railroads, and in harbors (we are finding in some of our areas), and we respond to medical emergencies. The list goes on and on for all kinds of manmade and national disasters.

So we are the front line disaster people in the community and we need help. We recognize that balanced budgets have to be made; there is no question about that. And some organizational changes have to be made as well. But we also recognize that some priorities have to be given to what is important to us in this country.

We are a little frustrated about cutting the programs that are still needed for the Fire Service and those that are not finished yet. Every one of those programs in some way impacts our community. It is the folks outside of the Fire Service who are deciding what our priorities are. We get frustrated with somebody who got a red pen for Christmas and decided to go through our programs with it, without knowing what we really do.

It seems like we come back here every couple of years; like I said to you before. We still need some things for the Fire Service. We still need to work toward reducing the fire deaths in this country, which is the worst record in the world, in the industrial nations.

We need to cut property damage from fire, and I think the examples you saw just before the hearing started, on the sprinkler system, is one way to do that. We need to continue to improve our fire prevention education programs for the children and adults of this country. We need to continue the education of our fire officers in all aspects of fire prevention, fire protection, and fire control.

We need to continue those research programs which are important to us, especially in the area of toxicity, building materials, fire-resistant furniture and cigarette-related items as well.

We need to continue our fire data collection system so we can get a better picture of what it is we need to do. We need to further promote the advantages of early warning and fire control systems such as smoke detectors and sprinklers, and we need to be recognized as a fire protection agency that deals with a full gamut of services for each of our communities.

We need to emphasize the fact that about 25 to 30 percent of our fire chiefs are also Emergency Management Directors in their area. We do so many things for a community that a lot of citizens do not understand. We need help when we give all of these services. The Fire Service still needs the U.S. Fire Administration, the National Fire Academy and the Center for Fire Research. We need a nationwide research program. We cannot do research Statewide and we cannot do it in our communities. We just have to have that national emphasis and we think this is important.

We think that there will be tremendous impacts if these programs are cut. The fire service will not be able to give those services that we need to do. We need data badly; to be able to tell how to get arson stopped; and we need the information from the Fire Service that will stop arson and the other disasters that are taking place in our communities—the death and the destruction.

I think that the financial cut impact also would effect the numbers of people that are now going to the Academy. It is bothering us a little bit to see somebody else decide that the stipend should go from Academy program, and I do not understand that at all.

There is going to be a lot of impact for a lot of departments who cannot go to the Academy if that cut takes place; small volunteer fire departments all the way up to the metropolitan departments. Small departments have no money. Metropolitan departments are getting cut in two places; in revenue sharing and stripend cuts.

So I think it is important that those impacts be considered.

Out of the States that send people to the Academy, the State of Washington is number 3, and out of the top 12 there are 5 of them from the western States. And we will not be able to go. I just talked to the chief of Centralia just the other day. He just came back from the Academy. All of his classmates were totally frustrated by the fact that they will not be able to come back and get that much needed training.

By the way, they need to get together to share ideas as well as what goes on in the Academy. It is very important to them.

I must tell you that the frustration is at a very high level if the chiefs think this programing is going to come to a stop now when we still need this help from a national level. So what we are doing is trying to emphasize the needs of the national programs. We still need these programs to help the Fire Service with the things that we need to educate ourselves and the general public in the good safety practices in fire conditions.

We need to maintain national programs of research and development; good programs to cut death loss and property loss and, of course, to improve our living environment. And we need help with training programs for all fire departments from small to large, so that we may do our job better.

I think the rest of the comments that I have are in written form. But I would like to bring these comments to you to show you what our frustrations are, and I really thank you very much for the opportunity to make my statement.

Senator GORTON. You have done so, very eloquently.

[The statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF ROBERT ELY, FIRST VICE PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIRE CHIEFS

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to thank you for inviting me, as a representative of the International Association of Fire Chiefs, to testify on this matter of vital importance not only to the American fire service, but to the citizens of this country threatened by fire, medical emergencies and other hazards requiring emergency response.

I also want to thank this subcommittee and you, its members, for the consistent and unswerving support that you have shown in past years when there have been similar attempts to almost eliminate the federal fire program.

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, representing this nation's chief fire officers, is here to speak for those fire chiefs who are charged with managing and administering the fire departments that are the nation's first line of defense against fires, medical emergencies, floods, earthquakes, hazardous materials emergencies, and an endless number of manmade and natural disasters. In other words, our members are charged with protecting the public. Therefore, I appear before this subcommittee today to defend those federal programs that help our members to do a more effective job of protecting the public.

What do you think would be the reaction if, every month, one fully loaded 747 took off from Washington and another took off from Los Angeles, and they collided somewhere over the Midwest, killing everyone aboard both planes. The official and public outcry would be deafening; the attention given this problem would fill newspapers and television screens across the country. Yet, that is approximately how many people we kill in fires every month in this country. And the outcry is far from deafening.

Before this hearing is over, another three people will die in fires because fire kill approximately one person an hour. Unfortunately, most of those killed will be either over 65 or under 10 years of age.

The human suffering and loss from fire is tragic. However, the economic loss is staggering. The overall annual loss from arson alone is in excess of $4-billion. From fires in general, the loss is in the tens of billions of dollars. The point that we will try to make this afternoon is that with a modest amount of seed money—the $25-million devoted to the federal fire programs—those programs, over the last several years, have reversed a national trend and have caused a decline in the country's human and financial fire loss statistics.

Since the federal fire programs were started in the mid-1970s, we can register the following successes primarily resulting from stimulus provided by the fire administration and fire academy:

The fire community worked for more than a decade to convince Congress of the need for a federal focus on fire, particularly fire prevention. The justification for these programs, the U.S. Fire Administration and National Fire Academy, has not changed.

Since the USFA and NFA programs have been in operation, life and property loss from fire has turned downward. In a six-year period, deaths are down to 6,000 annually from a high of almost 8,000.

As a result of USFA public education programs and leadership, smoke detectors have been installed in more than 60% of the nation's homes.

The USFA's National Fire Incident Reporting System was established and now links more than 11,000 fire departments in 39 states. This information exchange network is invaluable both as a gauge of the fire problem and our success in combatting it. It can be managed effectively only at the federal level.

The USFA has developed one of the world's most effective resources for fighting arson. This includes juvenile firesetters programs, arson early warning systems, an arson information management system and development support for local anti-arson activities. Statistics now show that total incendiary and suspicious structure fires are down 35% from a peak in 1977. Civilian deaths in these same fires are down 24% from the peak in 1977.

The USFA has taken the lead in developing a number of important fire fighter health and safety programs, including Project FIRES, the purpose of which is to design new state-of-the-art protective clothing for fire fighters. It is important to point out that Project FIRES did not reinvent the wheel, but took proven "spin-off" technology from NASA's space program and adapted it to the fire service. Project FIRES also has involved the private sector in developing materials for the protective clothing.

The USFA is a much-needed clearinghouse of fire information. It has played a leading role in disseminating information on fire prevention, the use of smoke detec-

tors and sprinkler systems and a five-step planning process for public fire safety education program managers.

The fire administration has made a special effort to reach out to children—the frequent victims of deadly fires. In fact, children under five account for 17% of all fire deaths. This effort has included the successful production of the Sesame Street pre-school fire awareness program.

The National Fire Academy serves as an advanced training facility for the American fire service at all levels of government. The academy has played a major role in standardizing the use of proven fire protection programs and grooming the professional men and women called upon to use them.

Recent years have seen a marked increase in public concern over toxic chemical accidents. In communities across the country, it is nearly always the fire service that must respond when these incidents occur. The National Fire Academy is the ONLY federal training facility with a clear mandate to give hazardous materials training to local-level emergency response personnel. In a recent IAFC survey, more that half of the public fire departments that responded said that they received their outside training from the National Fire Academy. Elimination of the academy's student stipends will eliminate the primary affordable source of hazardous materials training available to the fire service. It also will mean that the emergency response personnel expected to handle hazardous materials accidents (i.e., protect the public) will not have anywhere to get this vital training.

Federal funding for fire prevention programs is extremely cost-effective. Few federal programs can boast as many accomplishments with a total budget of less than $25-million a year (USFA—$7.364-million; NFA—$11.691-million; and CFR—$5.81-million. Total—$24.856-million).

The $25-million needed to fund federal fire programs is insignificant compared to the $312-billion requested for defense programs in the fiscal 1987 budget. In fact, it would cost the taxpayers $10-million less to fund all federal fire programs than to purchase one F-18 fighter aircraft.

Although I realize it will be the subject of another hearing, before closing I want to say a word in defense of the Center for Fire Research at the National Bureau of Standards. The center is an internationally respected scientific research facility. The elimination of the center would destroy the only federal scientific body that has aggressively researched and analyzed the chemistry and physics of fire. This pioneering effort has led to a fundamental understanding of the nature of combustion and the development of fire-resistant materials and building techniques.

It is also worth pointing out that the Center for Fire Research was primarily responsible for developing the technology that lead to the smoke detector and the quick response sprinkler . . . two technologies that the fire administration is using to promote improved fire safety across the country. This is a good example of the flow of technology and information from the center to the fire administration to the public.

Finally, elimination of the Center for Fire Research would leave the United States as the only industrialized nation without a central, federal fire research facility . . . an embarassment in light of the fact that the U.S. has one of the highest fire death rates of any of the industrialized nations.

We realize the need for a balanced federal budget and the absolute necessity to reduce our sizable federal deficits . . . and we realize that there will be some changes as a result. However, we also realize the need: to continue the essential downward trend in fire deaths and injuries; to continue the reduction in property loss from fire; to have a sound fire prevention education program across the country; to educate fire officers in ALL aspects of fire protection; to continue fire research programs; to maintain and improve the national fire data system; and to promote to the fullest extent automatic detection, alarm and suppression systems.

We can accomplish all of these objectives and more by refunding the U.S. Fire Administration, National Fire Academy and Center for Fire Research at their current budget levels . . . a modest annual investment of $25-million. . . . $10-million less than the cost of the one F-18 jet fighter. Twenty-five million dollars . . . and the prospects are good we can continue the downward trend in the tens of billions of dollars we lose in this country every year from fire.

How can we measure the value to our society of those who are still alive because of these programs. Statistically, it is likely that somebody in this room or a family member of someone in this room right now might number among the almost 10,000 lives saved over the last five years. Funding for the programs is more than dollars. It is a statement and commitment on the part of the whole country that fire is a problem with which we must deal.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

Senator GORTON. Mr. Henry.

Mr. HENRY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. My name is Chet Henry. I am the State fire commissioner for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; also the director of fire safety services located within the Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency.

In Pennsylvania they created a statewide fire focal point in 1976 and as a result of that statewide fire focal point, we then became eligible to participate in the many resources available through the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, and the U.S. Fire Administration.

I am here today to tell you how Pennsylvania has taken advantage of the tremendous amount of benefits that we reap as a result of the involvement of the Federal Fire Prevention Control Administration and the U.S. Fire Administration.

So with that, running right along, I am told I have 5 minutes. I guarantee I will do it in 5 minutes. I would like to use these transparencies.

[Slide shown.]

Mr. HENRY. All the Federal resources that filter into Pennsylvania as a result of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 come directly through the Federal Government, and through the Office of Fire Safety Services, and then go directly to the local communities. That is what that particular transparency depicts.

As you can see, our first experience and opportunity came probably in 1977 when we were the recipient of a $14,856 grant to develop a Statewide organizational design program for fire service training in the Commonwealth.

Our second opportunity came in 1978 when we received a $40,000 master planning grant. In reality, that is to develop a cost-effective fire management program.

And, third, through the advent of public education in 1979, Pennsylvania was accepted into a 3-year, three-phase program called PEAP, Public Education Assistance Program, and even though the amount of the dollar figure awarded was only $35,000, the activity generated and the benefits created by that grant were indeed very impressive.

In addition to those grants, I would just like to take a few minutes to tell you about the financial support that we received most recently in addition to those previous grants mentioned. Pennsylvania was one of ten States selected to participated in the newly-created FEMA Community Volunteer Fire Prevention Program. That grant was designed to get community volunteer organizations working together by utilizing and sharing and disseminating resources.

Each State was awarded $70,000 to award three grants to suburban, urban and rural areas that would impact the fire problem. The first recipient of the $25,000 urban grant was made to the Museum of Scientific Discovery in Harrisburg, PA and they really did a tremendous job in developing a talking computer-driven program for children that teaches children the science of fire prevention and fire safety. And in addition to the computer, there is a life-sized model house that teaches children how to properly prepare and do an exit drill in a home.

The second recipient was the northeast office of the Burn Foundation located in Allentown, PA. They got $25,000 to develop a five-part program dealing with our senior citizens. Some of the categories addressed were care, maintenance and placement of smoke detectors, clothing ignition, home safety, cooking safety and fire survival.

The third grant, a $10,000 grant, was awarded to the Allegheny Community Fire Prevention Program and they developed an eight-foot wide, 40-foot long mobile trailer that travels across Pennsylvania and they cover the categories of fire prevention, fire protection and fire survival. And today, we hear so much about the dangers of alternative heating devices. This trailer also emphasizes the proper uses of alternative heating devices. That is an outstanding program.

This shows you the benefits of each one of those grants. As the result of the OD program, the Organizational Design, it was just a study report that was issued. That was the end result of that. As the result of the master planning grant, another study report was issued which we can make available for anybody within our State that is interested in developing cost-effective fire management programs. We provide these reports and guidelines for that.

But look at that $35,000 grant if you will, please. Only $35,000 was awarded for a public education assistance program but here are the developed results: a resource catalog manual that identifies all the resources that are available, resource centers, that we stock across the Commonwealth; seasonal packets of fire prevention material; a cadre of instructors developed in every county to go out and disseminate these programs; biennial fire awards program; many grants that we made available to people in the State; training sessions, public service announcements, et cetera.

1984 and 1985. You can see the Community Volunteer Fire Prevention Program. I just highlighted the benefits and the results of that particular program.

That is the way the Community Volunteer Fire Prevention Program is supposed to work. In the State, we developed a voluntary statewide coordinating committee that administers this particular grant. We have the urban, the suburban and the rural all working together, exchanging ideas and resources.

Again, look at the involvement we have here. We have the State agencies. We have Fire Service organizations. We have the local community volunteer organizations. We have the private sector. And we have community volunteers. I do not think you can get more use out of individual dollars than you can when you use this particular type concept as far as the Community Volunteer Fire Prevention Program is concerned.

Look how it ended up by geographical distribution in the State: Harrisburg is right in the center of our State, the Museum of Scientific Discovery, number two; the Burn Foundation. Geographically you can also see the location of it as number three in Allegheny township. So it was well distributed across our State.

Look at the target. We have heard many, many times that the two age categories most susceptible to fire are 65 years and over, our senior citizens, and 5 years and younger, our small children. Harrisburg's program deals directly with our small children.

The Burn Foundation's program deals directly with our elderly, and Altoona with the general community.

I am pleased to tell you that replication is the intent of the Community Volunteer Fire Prevention Program. We have already been able to replicate the programs of the "Firehouse Mouse" in Pennsylvania. One has been implemented at the Franklin Institute in Philadelphia, and the other was placed in the Buhl Science Center in Pittsburgh, PA. And just think of the number of children that pass through those three particular facilities in a particular year, and the number of children that we are getting that fire prevention message across to.

The U.S. Fire Administration. I cannot say enough about that as far its connection with the National Fire Academy is concernec. The National Fire Academy, as far as I am concerned, created a new dimension of fire service training in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and all across this Nation. It prepares firefighters today that are better prepared physically, mentally, and academically. They are now, I think, geared to cope and deal with all kinds of man made and natural disasters.

As far as the USFA itself is concerned, we had a real serious problem in Pennsylvania in 1980 as a result of the insidious crime of arson. We have been told many times that arson is the most malignant crime in the country and it has been running rampant all across the nation. One phone call to the U.S. Fire Administration was made and we asked for some assistance, technical assistance, to address the arson problem in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

They sent in a team to conduct 14 arson seminars across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in high risk-prone arson areas. The point that I must make is that at the time that we made that request in 1980, the Uniform Crime Report revealed that there were 5,087 arson offenses. In 1985, using the most current data available, that same UCR report reveals a 40 percent decrease—3,070 incidents.

This would not have been possible had it not been for the technical assistance made available through the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Administration and the U.S. Fire Administration.

Look at the saturation across our State of resources, the benefits that were provided through that.

Education. Look at the saturation of education, through both technical and educational resources. You cannot get a better bang out of a dollar than what the U.S. Fire Administration has been making possible recently.

There are the exact site locations of all high-risk arson-prone areas within our State. There is the exact name of the coordinators, the site locations, the names and the whole bit, and exactly when those arson seminars have been conducted.

And I cannot begin to highlight this last slide that I have here. Look at the number of decreases in fire deaths since the creation of our State fire focal point that enabled us to become involved with the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 and the NFPCA/USFA. When we started in 1976, there were 387 fatalities.

Looking at the most current data, which is for 1984, it has dropped down to 294, for a 25 percent decrease.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say to you that the humanitarian and the economic benefits made possible through the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 and the U.S. Fire Administration must never be allowed to die.

Thank you.

[The statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF CHARLES A. HENRY, STATE FIRE COMMISSIONER, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Sub-Committee, good afternoon. My name is Chet Henry; I am the State Fire Commissioner for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and Director of the Office of Fire Safety Services within the Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency. Pennsylvania, as you undoubtedly know, has the largest volunteer fire program in the United States.

With the establishment of our state fire focal point in 1976, Pennsylvania became eligible to participate in the various technical and financial assistance programs emanating from the National Fire Prevention and Control Administration—now the United States Fire Administration. Those programs have then filtered down from us, either directly or indirectly, to local communities. Since 1976, slightly over $200,000 has been received by the state from various federal sources to impact upon the fire program.

Our first experience and opportunity to participate in a federal grant was in 1977 and 1978, when we obtained $14,856 to implement a statewide organizational plan for fire education and training in Pennsylvania under the Academy Planning Assistance Program—APAP.

Our second opportunity came in 1978 when we were able to participate in a $40,000 grant to test the feasibility of state level fire prevention and control master planning under the Policy Development Assistance Program—PDAP.

Our third opportunity came with the advent of the Public Education Assistance Program—PEAP. In 1979, we were awarded a three-year three-phase grant to develop and implement a comprehensive statewide public education and assistance program for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The amount awarded was $35,000; the activity generated and the benefits created by this particular grant were impressive indeed.

I am pleased to tell you how the federal government has supported our state efforts most recently, in addition to those programs previously referenced.

In the Fall of 1984, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was one of the first ten pilot states selected to participate in FEMA's "Community Volunteer Fire Prevention Program".

The goals and objectives of Pennsylvania's CVFPP are being achieved by a State Fire Prevention Coordinating Committee, administered through the Office of Fire Safety Services.

Among the local Community Volunteer Organizations competing for federal funding, the following awards were made:

The $25,000 urban grant was awarded to the Museum of Scientific Discovery, Harrisburg, for a computer-driven exhibit, "Firehouse Mouse", to teach the science of fire prevention and fire safety to children. The exhibit also includes a life-sized model house where youngsters are taught proper procedures for an exit drill in the home.

The $25,000 suburban grant was awarded to the Northeast Office of The Burn Foundation, Allentown, for a five-part program to teach fire and burn safety to the elderly. The program addresses clothing ignition; placement, care and maintenance of smoke detectors; home hazards; cooking safety, and fire survival.

The $10,000 rural grant was awarded to the Allegheny Township Fire Prevention Community Programs, Inc., Altoona, for a mobile trailer training module to teach firel prevention, fire protection and fire safety survival skills to communities. This training includes the proper and improper installation of auxiliary heating units and early detection systems.

You will be pleased to learn that the OFSS has already replicated two of the urban "Firehouse Mouse" exhibits and installed them at the Franklin Institute in Philadelphia and the Buhl Science Center in Pittsburgh. More replications of our three CVFPP model programs will follow.

Because of programs like APAP and PDAP, we are better planners and strategists, resulting in a more cost-efficient fire loss management system for our Commonwealth. Because of PEAP, we are one of the leaders in fire safety education today, networking and sharing resources as we have been so carefully taught, and saving countless lives, jobs and dollars as the result of our efforts. Because of the CVFPP, we have been able to develop "showcase" quality model programs which will be replicated not only throughout the Commonwealth, but throughout the nation.

Our progress and developmental achievements through the CVFPP are, of course, recent and therefore more visible—but let me give you another example of how USFA technical assistance has paid off in our state.

During October, 1980, the month during which Fire Prevention Week traditionally falls, the USFA sent out one of its teams to conduct fourteen Arson Task Force Workshops within Pennsylvania.

During the year 1980, there were 5,087 Arson offenses in the Commonwealth according to the Pennsylvania State Police's Uniform Crime Report. In 1985 there were 3,017 offenses, or a decrease of 40.6%. Certainly a great proportion of that large decrease—and the economic savings which have resulted—are attributable to the USFA's Arson Task Force concept.

Finally, I would like to draw your attention to the chart which shows the decline in the number of fire deaths since the inception of the state fire focal point in Pennsylvania. It would be hard for me to estimate what this chart would show if it were not for the technical and financial assistance that has been funneled into the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania from the United States Fire Administration.

Pennsylvania has been one of the strongest state supporters of the USFA since its very inception—and not simply because of its resources. We believe in it. We believe that we still need a federal fire focal point to track the national trends, oversee the big picture, determine program emphases and lend a helping hand through technical assistance when needed and financial assistance when available.

The humanitarian and economic advances made possible by the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974—and the United States Fire Administration—must not be allowed to die.

Thank you for your attention. I shall be happy to answer any questions you may have at this time or once the panel presentations have been concluded.

Senator GORTON. Thank you, Mr. Henry.

Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir. I will be brief. You have my remarks and I would just like to stress two things; that which the Fire Administration has developed through its technical assistance and research, is being used on a day-to-day basis with local government fire departments.

I am representing the International City Management Association which represents 50 percent of the professional managers throughout the country. Without the kind of research and technical assistance the USFA and the NFTA has given in the past, we would not be able to take advantage of that which we have taken advantage of.

The Sesame Street program, we have run 30,000 children in Arlington County through in four years. The technical assistance for sprinklers and plastic pipe and rapid deployment heads, we are finding ways now of retrofitting hotels in Arlington County and we are also finding ways of providing incentives for developers in major housing developments.

In terms of the technical assistance and research in protective clothing, as soon as that gets beyond the experimental stage, just like helmuts, you can be assured that local governments throughout the country will be taking advantage of that kind of research to protect our own firefighters.

Our membership represents to you that fire is not a fire department problem. It is a local government problem that has socioeconomic ramifications throughout all communities, and we would ask you to continue your support of the Fire Administration.

Thank you very much.

[The statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF LARRY J. BROWN

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. My name is Larry J. Brown. I am the County Manager of Arlington County, Virginia. I am here today on behalf of the International City Management Association (ICMA). ICMA is the professional and educational association of appointed administrators in cities, counties and regional councils of governments.

Since 1974, when the U.S. Fire Administration was first created under Public Law 93-498 tremendous progress has been made on a national level in reducing the loss of life and property through better fire prevention and control.

We can directly attribute this success to the work of the U.S. Fire Administration.

The Federal focus on the national fire problem especially through the development of new technologies for firefighter protection, fire prevention and public education has accounted for this outstanding progress.

All of us here must take pride in such work as:

The Sesame Street project which provides fire education for elementary and preschool children. In Arlington County we have reached over 30,000 children because of this initiative.

The reduction in loss of life (from 9,000 in 1975 to 6,000 in 1985) because of smoke detectors and residential sprinklers. Residential sprinklers that through the research sponsored by U.S. Fire Administration are now financially feasible at 1% of the cost of new construction. In Arlington County one hotel has been retrofitted with sprinkler systems using polybutylene piping which is a major component of the residential sprinkler system. This project was also responsible for the development of the quick reacting sprinkler head.

The development of special firefighter turn out gear and equipment that are reducing the high casualty rate we have experienced in that profession. In Arlington County, this has created a safer work environment and has also reduced our liability costs.

Most communities even those as resourceful as Arlington County do not have the capability of providing the economies of scale that the U.S. Fire Administration provides through its technical assistance, research and development and fire prevention programs.

Even with these successes, the United States, although reduced still experiences high fire losses in life and property higher than any other industrial nation in the world. In 1984 we lost 7.7 billion dollars in direct property loss. This figure does not take into account indirect economic and personal losses such as unemployment due to fire.

The benefits provided by the U.S. Fire Administration and the national focus it provides at a cost of 7.4 million dollars is a small price to pay in comparison.

I am not here as a representative of the fire service but as a representative of the association that represents appointed local chief executives that administer over 50% of the cities and counties in the United States. Fire is a community wide problem not just a fire department problem. The economic impact of fire can be disastrous and effects us all.

I am here today to urge you to continue your support for the U.S. Fire Administration. Many positive benefits have resulted from this Federal focus. A substantial amount of work remains to be done. Only through your support can we continue to make progress towards solving the Nation's fire problem.

Thank you.

Senator GORTON. Mr. Jackson, to give us a different perspective from the insurance point of view.

Mr. JACKSON. Because my written remarks go into more detail than we can afford the time for today, I will concentrate on just two points. In my job as advocacy programs director for Allstate, I am responsible for developing programs to reduce the losses that make insurance so costly. And in doing that, I have to pay a great deal of attention to cost effectiveness.

That is one of the reasons why on the two programs where I am associated with the U.S. Administration, I have appreciated the quality of the work that they have done. For example, in the residential sprinkler project. When I first joined it as a member of the National Fire Protection Association Residential Sprinkler Subcommittee, the U.S. Fire Administration representative was already there working with the technical experts and the company people to develop the standards for a series of life safety fire tests to demonstrate the benefits of residential sprinklers.

When I explained to him that an important element in the spread of use of residential sprinklers was the acceptance of them by insurance companies, we worked out a program to include in that life safety series of tests eight matched tests of sprinkler and non-sprinkler fires to demonstrate the value of the quick response sprinklers as an economic benefit as well as a life safety benefit.

Now, the Fire Administration was not alone in this. They put up the starter money. But on that committee, other members put something in the pot, too. The Los Angeles Airport Authority gave us two houses to use for the test purpose. The Copper Development Association donated the copper tubing and also paid for the installation. Grinnell Fire Protection Systems designed the system. The Allstate Foundation came up with $10,000 to supply the houses with the draperies, the bedding and the other things that would help to give the adjusters a chance to estimate the economic loss.

The Marriott Corporation, which came in there in a very interesting way, donated the furniture. The success of those test burns demonstrated the validity of the theory, and since that time, just for example what has happened as a result of the tests, the Marriott Corporation made the decision not only to go ahead and do some tests on their own, but they decided to retrofit all of the Marriott hotels and motels with residential sprinklers in the habitational portions of the hotels.

They have also made a commitment that they will not build a single new structure without putting the fast response sprinklers in the habitational sections. This, I think, is going to demonstrate that the Fire Administration not only demonstrated the validity of the concept but advanced by years the acceptance of this new technology.

Now, that comes back to the community in a benefit, not just in the saving of property and the saving of lives, but it is also going to come back as a cost saving measure to the communities, because the community that is basically equipped with residential sprinklers is going to be able to handle their responses with lighter weight equipment; they will be able to put out many of the fires with hand-held equipment rather than unraveling hose, and there are a number of ways where the effect of these less severe fires will work out to the benefit of the community.

Another project where I was personally involved with the U.S. Fire Administration, was working with them on arson prevention. And my work with them on this came as a result of my role as chairman of the

insurance committee for arson control. This is an association that represents the majority of fire insurance companies doing business in the United States.

When arson was first determined to be a serious crime, the U.S. Fire Administration sponsored a 2-day conference at the Battelle Institute to bring about 36 leaders together and try and get a good description of what were the elements of the problem and what would be a good stategy to follow in trying to beat it.

Following that meeting, which was a success, the USFA published the proceedings in a document called "Arson: America's Malignant Crime," this served for 10 years as a blueprint for how to fight arson. Later the USFA held a conference at Airlie, VA, a much broader leadership conference, bringing together those people who were necessary in order to implement the strategies.

These people went back and started task forces and where those task forces were started, there has been a noticeable drop in the rate of arson and an increase in the number of convictions.

The significant thing about both those projects is this: The money and the leadership supplied by the U.S. Fire Administration could not have come from the private sector and it could not have come from the State or local level. It took national leadership to get the people together to identify the problem and start to move. And once the Fire Administration did this, they stepped back and handed it off to the private sector.

For example, in May of this year, the insurance committee for arson control will sponsor the second meeting of national leaders. Thirty-six people again are being brought together from the public and private sector. At this time, the U.S. Fire Administration is going to take part, but they are taking part now as a guest-participant, a respected guest participant, rather than as a host. The entire conference is funded with private funds.

The work in residential sprinklers is going ahead at a very fast rate. In addition to the work of the Marriott Corporation, Cobb County, GA has encouraged builders down there to use the quick response sprinklers in multifamily habitations. So there is a lot of good work that is going on around the country now that would not have gone on if the U.S. Fire Administration had not started it off. Yet, even though this work has been done, and they may be able to step back a bit and pass it on to the private sector, there are other very signficant areas that need their leadership right now. And if we do not have the U.S. Fire Administration to provide that leadership and bring the right people together, I think we are going to pay a terrible price, not just in the human terms of the lives that are lost, but in the loss of housing stock which is too expensive to replace.

Thank you.

[The statement follows:]

Statement of Ralph J. Jackson

My name is Ralph Jackson. I am the Director of Advocacy Programs for Allstate Insurance Company. In that position I am responsible for: identification of loss causes that contribute significantly to the cost of insurance; design of programs to make measurable reductions in these losses; and formation of effective realtionships with fellow insurers, other private sector groups and governmental entities capable of helping reduce these human and economic losses.

In carrying our these responsibilities, I have served for seven years as a member of the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) subcommittee on residential sprinklers. Also, for the past two years I have served as Chairman for the Insurance Committee for Arson Control (ICAC), an organization serving the majority of property insurance companies doing business in the United States.

I appreciate the opportunity to address this subcommittee. My remarks are confined to two U.S. Fire Administration projects in which I have personally participated representing either Allstate or ICAC. At the conclusion, I will make a general comment on the Fire Administration and the Fire Academy. I hope that the narrow scope of my remarks will not be seen as a reflection on Fire Administration activities with which I'm not familiar enough to comment.

In commenting on two projects, residential sprinklers and arson prevention, I will focus on those aspects of the projects which demonstrate the Fire Administration's determination to make measurable progress and their use of federal prestige and funds to leverage substantial private sector participation.

RESIDENTIAL SPRINKLERS

At the time I joined the NFPA Residential Sprinkler Subcommittee, the Fire Administration representative was already there interacting with technical experts and industry representatives. They were working out the standards and conditions for a series of test burns to measure the life safety potential of a new generation of residential sprinklers. The decision was made to expand the scope of the tests to demonstrate the ability of the new system to reduce property loss as well as loss of life.

While the Fire Administration offered the starter money, the project received the following assistance: two houses from the Los Angeles airport authority; the Copper Development Association donated and installed the necessary tubing; Grinnell Fire Protection systems donated the engineering design work; the Marriott Hotels donated furniture; the Allstate Foundation donated $10,000 to equip the tests with the clothing, drapes and other personal items to make it possible to assess the total economic impact of each test fire; and 14 men representing the property insurance trade associations and major companies formed an ad hoc committee to serve as advisors and eight companies contributed the services of ten adjusters to serve as a jury on the economic loss of each fire.

The project demonstrated the validity of the theoretical work as it applied to one and two family dwellings.

Since that time, the Marriott Corporation has cooperated in tests that demonstrated the value of modifying conventional sprinkler installations with the quick response sprinklers to cover the habitational sections of hotels. Following those tests they made a commitment to retrofit all existing Marriotts with sprinkler systems and to make them a part of all new Marriott construction. Cobb County, Georgia, has encouraged installation of modified sprinkler systems in multi-family construction to improve the quality of life protection.

The result of the Fire Administration's leadership was to advance by many years the development and acceptance of this new sprinkler concept. As its use becomes more widespread, communities will suffer less loss of housing stock. Fires will be less severe. Fewer firemen and civilians will be hurt and less of a burden put on the social services units by fire victims. Such an environment will not only be a friendlier one in human terms, the fire protection costs will become more manageable for the communities.

ARSON PREVENTION

Early in the 1970s arson was referred to as the nation's fastest growing crime. To help the country get a handle on this problem, the Fire Administration sponsored a two-day meeting of public and private sector leaders. At this conference the elements of the problem were identified and a long-range strategy was developed. The recommendations were published in the book "Arson: America's Malignant Crime."

Next, the Fire Administration sponsored a broader leadership conference at Arlie, Virginia, to foster interaction between the private and public leaders needed to implement the strategies. These leaders went back home and served as program generators. Where the recommended programs developed, arson rates have dropped and convictions have risen.

With the general task force programs set in motion, the Fire Administration turned its efforts to the development and encouragement of information based programs capable of predicting which structures were unusually vulnerable to arson . . . particularly fraud arson. The Administration followed the same pattern as before. Tehy assembled the appropriate leadership group to design and implement programs at the community level. The Administration then sponsored a number of pilot programs to test the concept and its value to the communities.

There are two points to be drawn from the manner in which the Fire Administration launched these state and local level task forces and arson prevention programs. First, the strategies were not desinged to be implemented at the national level. They were guidelines for implementation at the state and local levels. Second, the initiative has been passed to the private sector. On May 21 and 22 of this year, the Insurance Committee for Arson Control has called a leadership conference to reexamine the problem, assess progress made in the last ten years and develop a strategy for the next ten years. This time the private sector is the host and the Fire Administration has been invited to attend as a respected guest-participant. The information based arson early warning systems started with the Fire Administration's help have inspired a second generation of programs under the sponsorship of the Ford Foundation and the Insurance Committee for Arson Control. They are nearing completion of a five-city programs to test the value of more direct participation by neighborhood activists and local insurers in addition to the participants common to earlier programs.

A reasonable person might ask why it is necessary for the Fire Administration to continue if it has done such a fine job of inspiring effective action at the state and local levels. To this I would respond that my experience with the fire Administration has touched on only a few of their responsibilities. While they have been able to reduce their level of involvement in the few activities I commented on, there are many remaining opportunities that present themselves for significant reduction of the tremendous fire losses suffered annually in this country.

The world's highest losses of lives and property due to fire are suffered in the United States and Canada. These two countries also rank lowest in the world in their attention to fire prevention. We are very good at fire suppression. We should be; we get enough practice. That last remark should not be taken as a slur against our nation's firefighters. The tragic number of these individuals who die each year is a testimonial to their heroism and dedication. But, every year changes are made in residential building materials and the products stored in commercial ventures. The challenges facing firefighters increase each year. And yet, eighty percent of the firefighters facing these challenges are volunteers.

There is a great need for national leadership to help develop strategies to train fire service personnel for the job of prevention as well as suppression. There is an equal need for strategies to improve the citizen's role in the fire prevention. The role of the Fire Administration and the Fire Academy in these activities is pivotal. In the absence of intelligent national leadership, there will be duplication of expenses in those states addressing the problem. There will be increasing losses in terms of human suffering and destruction of housing stock in those states that don't address the problem or follow an ineffective plan.

Few recent problems have been as important and difficult as the one facing you as you develop a plan to bring expenses under control. I appreciate the opportunity to come before you to urge that, as you consider what strategy to follow, full consideration be given to the continuation of programs necessary to reduce the intolerable losses our nation suffers each year because of fire. Thank you.

Senator GORTON. Gentlemen, I thank each of you for eloquent testimony.

Mr. Henry, that was a great show. I really want to compliment you on it.

Senator GORTON. You are all familiar with the word "emergency," and I have an emergency this afternoon which came up only last night and this morning and I must be elsewhere.

I was going to submit our questions to you in writing, but we are going to have to make decisions on this subject quite promptly. So I am going to leave our staff director here and have him present these questions to you right now and have you answer them so that we have them in our record and can utilize them in connection with deliberations in which we will be engaged very, very promptly.

So if you will cooperate and stay, you now have less in the way of time constraints, and really say what you want, say what you need us to know as we make these decisions.

Thank you very, very much.

Mr. OSTROM. I have a couple of questions that I would like each member of the panel to address if they would like to.

The first one is that FEMA has stated that the President proposes to eliminate the activities of the U.S. Fire Administration because they are primarily State and local responsibilities and they could be performed by voluntary organizations or private industry. That is their rationale.

So would any of you care to comment from your perspective on the logic of this justification for eliminating the Fire Administration, and on the likelihood that these kinds of programs would be continued by State and local fire services or by the private sector?

Mr. ELY. I would like to comment. I have a hard time with that, to be honest with you, because although I would agree that once some of the decisions are made and once some direction is found for State and local government, there are lots of things that we can do.

But the studies that are needed on a nationwide basis, the training that is needed on a nationwide basis, the informational functions that probably can only come from an organization such as the U.S. Fire Administration, has to be done on this national level.

One of them is public education, as an example. Who can best get a nationwide focal point other than an organization like the U.S. Fire Administration? We locally take advantage of this public education but it has to start there, and it has. There are a lot of programs that have gone on, but there are still a lot more to go. I would hate to think at this point that we have taken a program that was successful and say "now that we are successful, we do not need to do these anymore."

It would seem to me that it would be more appropriate to say that "if we are not successful, we do not need to do them anymore." But the USFA is a very viable and successful operation and it is a very much needed program. I cannot see the justification for the remark that was made.

Mr. HENRY. Very quickly, I would agree. I do not think that the individual States could do it with the same level of excellence that is done on the Federal level.

I really believe that through our Federal fire focal point, there was a momentum generated that is just totally unmatchable. We have now all the States integrating programs and sharing ideas, resources and net-

working together. This would never be possible if it were left to each individual State.

Mr. BROWN. My impression is if the Federal Government do not do it, individual States will then have the same choice that the Federal Government has in budget reductions at this point.

Virginia is not exactly noted for State assistance for local government, much as Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and Minnesota are. I used to work in Minnesota and Wisconsin but I would suggest that it just would not happen in the State of Virginia and the more wealthy local governments would have to find some way of doing it themselves, which they probably would, but that would leave a lot less wealthy, if you will, governments out trying to figure out how they are going to keep their people up to snuff and keep them ahead of the fire curve, if you will.

Mr. JACKSON. I think Mr. Brown made an excellent point about the fact that the States are under the same financial pressure that the Federal Government. But I would like to add a point to that; and that is, that if it were left to the local communities and to the States to perform the work that is now being done at the national level, you would enter into, at the very best, what is called the consensus process.

And the consensus process among 50 States without national leadership would take a long time. That is real expensive. Let's say, for example, that it delayed by ten years the introduction of residential sprinklers. That is a terribly important factor, because your housing stock turns over only maybe once in 50 years. We have got to get that process going as quickly as we can.

Let's say a new building material was introduced which turned out to be an unfortunate decision, that some style of architecture or some material had the potential for catastrophic results. Do we have to wait for the catastrophe to force us to develop a program, or can we do more through the U.S. Fire Administration to recognize the problem as it is developing and stop it from being installed all across the country. Otherwise we have to live with the problem until finally it is cycled out 50 years later.

I do not think we can afford the cost of putting up with that sort of catastrophic programing.

Mr. OSTROM. Okay, thank you.

Another question for all of you. In regard to both the Fire Academy and the Fire Administration, three things. What programs are the most important to you from your perspective? What weaknesses have you noticed in the programs that are conducted? And then, three, are there other things that ought to be initiated, new ideas?

Mr. JACKSON. One of the items that we have most important with the Fire Academy—I am not expert on all of the things that they offer—but one of the terribly important programs to us in the insurance industry is what they offer in terms of setting a new high standard for the training of arson investigators around the country.

It was not too long ago, just 10 or 15 years ago, that people said that the evidence of arson was destroyed in a fire. Well, it is not. It is always there. It just becomes more difficult to find. It takes a better

qualified person, and that person has to be qualified not only in the detection of arson, but in the gathering of enough evidence and the preserving of it in a way that makes it acceptable and persuasive evidence in court.

That takes a person who is not only skilled at gathering, but also presenting the evidence in the courtroom. That is terribly important, because if you do not get convictions, several things happen. The insurance company is almost destined to have to make a payout. The community has lost a structure. The perpetrator is going to get away with his crime and, with the insurance proceeds in his pocket, now has what he needs to leverage an even grander scheme.

One time somebody asked Joe Madden, when he was doing color on a TV show, why do they keep running that play through the middle of the line? And he said, until somebody makes you stop it, if it works you keep on doing it. And I think it works that way in arson, too. I think that is why we have appreciated the deterrent effect of the arson training program that goes on at the Fire Academy.

As one of the gentlemen pointed out earlier, these people that go to that Academy are not just students. They go back and they become instructors, and that is a terribly important multiplier effect of the Fire Academy. What you see there in the way of the number of people who graduate is not the number of people who are affected.

Mr. BROWN. I would like to second the training aspect of the Fire Academy in general and the necessity to network it once you get back to your own local government. We have our own full-time trainers in our community.

Secondly, I would like to also point out the R&D and product development side of the house. With a little bit oif seed money, this organization has been successful in promoting some real product breakthroughs that are faster, better and cheaper at the installation level through the housing community, through hotels, through development communities.

I do not think that would have happened. It may have happened, but it might have happened 10 or 15 years later, after multimillion dollar losses on a cumulative basis.

Those are the two areas that I am most familiar with.

Mr. HENRY. Chris, that is kind of a difficult decision to ask to prioritize between the two. However, I see the U.S. Fire Administration being more proactive.

Let me just clarify that comment a little bit if I may. They are more proactive because they deal more in public awareness, you know, a better informed public, fire safety education, proactive type things. They make those kinds of resources available.

I look at the Fire Academy as taking people that are prepared, ever ready to stand and meet whatever disaster that they are called upon to meet. The USFA, too, tries to be as proactive as it possibly can, but we have to live in a world of reality. There is no way we are ever going to totally erase the fire problem. It is going to be here to stay as long as we have people on the face of the earth, and I think you realize that. So I do not think you can really select one over the other.

When you talk about the Center for Fire Research, I do not know how anybody can ever, in all good faith, think about eliminating the Center for Fire Research. We live in a totally combustible environment. Everything around is capable of being burned. We live in a man-made world with many materials we know nothing about. And to eliminate that, I do not know, it is just playing a form of Russian roulette. What is out there? Who is going to monitor and look at the big picture?

So I do not think you can eliminate either of them.

Mr. ELY. I would like to paraphrase a comment that I heard from the Deputy Chief of a very large city, who went to the Academy, and his comment was something to the effect, "I thought I knew almost all there was to know about the Fire Service, being from a big city, until I went to the Academy."

The instructors taught him differently, and the comradeship and fellowship and knowledge he learned from his peers was also great. So you have to think about what the strengths of the Academy are for management functions. I think that we cannot possibly do away with the Academy programs if our Fire Service is going to grow. And as the Fire Service grows, quite frankly, so does the community, which was pointed out. We are just representatives of the people who live in each community.

The U.S. Fire Administration, 3 years ago when I testified here, I said I thought that there was a weakeness in was public eduction. And since that time, it has been turned around. If there was any weakness at all in the Fire Administration, it is the programs that we are not able to complete yet. We mentioned public education. We are just getting a good start on that.

When it comes to research and development, we are just getting a good start. And to cut that research off and cut that education off would just seem to have a disastrous effect.

Mr. OSTROM. Thank you.

One other question has to do with whether or not there is any duplication between the Federal programs and the State and local programs. So maybe Mr. Henry and Mr. Brown can verify whether or not that is true.

I get the impression there is no duplication.

Mr. BROWN. In Virginia there certainly is not. No, there is not.

Mr. HENRY. I would agree. I do not think there is any redundancy in our State program either.

Mr. ELY. I would be curious about where the question came from or what it really means.

If there was to be a redundancy at all, it would be rare. But the thing that really happens in the training functions, especially in the Academy, is that the Academy allows certain basics to be set up. And after that is done, then some of it is carried on in the States, no question about that. But not the same overall program that teaches the teachers, so to speak.

Mr. OSTROM. For Mr. Ely, a question on the student stipend program.

You are from the State of Washington which is pretty active in the Fire Academy and in fact in 1985 the only States that sent more students to the Academy were California and Florida, which have much larger populations.

So we know Washington is very interested in the programs, but if they did not have the student stipend program, what effect would that have on the students being able to attend, or what proportion might not be able to come if they have to pay their own transportation and lodging?

Mr. ELY. There would probably be a great race to see who would be fiftieth on the list instead of—well, we are third right now. I do not want to make it sound like doomsday, because we would find something to take its place, but it would not be the same kind of program.

Most of the Departments in the State of Washington would not be able to look forward to sending the numbers of people that go. I am not saying it would be zero, but it would certainly decrease it.

I am just guessing, 75 to 80 percent decrease in the number of people who go to the Academy, and maybe more than that. The reason for that is the kinds of cost cuts that we have to put up with in all budget areas. That is in cities, in fire districts, at the State level, it is just as tough financially as it is anyplace else. The Fire Academy allows us to go somewhere where we can meet with our peers, meet with the instructors who are able to give us an oral picture of what is really needed for good management, for good managing of people, and the fire tactic functions that we need to know.

Mr. HENRY. In Pennsylvania we have 2,746 volunteer fire companies, boasting a membership of 300,000 strong. And I doubt if 60 percent of those individuals, if they eliminate the stipend program, would ever be able to attend the NFA.

Mr. ELY. Pennsylvania is closer than Washington.

Mr. HENRY. We could jog down here—but if we have to come down and pay for our lodging and our meals, we are so hard-pressed financially in many of our counties that I am afraid they would not be able to do it.

Mr. OSTROM. A question for Mr. Jackson. I think you touched on this, but can you go over again the potential economic impact of not having the residential fire sprinkler system?

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to follow up on that with more detail.

The present residential sprinkler standard was set up in 1980, and it replaced one from 1976. The reason the 1976 one had to be replaced—although it was a really fine standard—was that the 1976 standard was so expensive nobody could afford it. And a remedy that no one can afford is like no remedy at all.

So the 1980 standard was put together and it had certain givens in it, one of which was that the fire had to be confined to the room of origin and kept at a level that was not life-threatening for a period of at least 10 minutes.

Now, what that does is, it allows the fire department to get away from the traditional need to make your response in less than 3 minutes.

Now, if you can respond in 10 minutes, it has a great deal to do with how close your fire station has to be to the location. If you are going to face a fire where there is no danger of flashover, you may be able to answer that, to respond and extinguish whatever is left of the fire with a hand-held extinguisher as opposed to unrolling hose.

Now, this, as your community becomes retrofitted with sprinklers, means that you have the ability to have greater fire protection without having to have a fire station in every neighborhood. It means as your community grows, you do not need to double or triple the number of fire stations, the number of pieces of fire equipment, and the number of firemen.

It also means that because the residential sprinkler has kept the fire in a non-life-threatening mode, you are going to have fewer firefighter injuries which means less worker's comp expense. It means that you do not have to have as many firemen in reserve to take the place of those who are on sick leave because fewer of them will be hurt.

The type of equipment that you will be buying to respond will not need to be as heavy-duty for your residential areas. Just such things as if you respond and put the fire out with a hand-held extinguisher or with a booster hose, you are not going to have to take the hose back to the fire department and hang it up to dry and have additional hose to put back on the truck to be ready for your next call.

And just the expense of replacing hose, while that might seem to be insignificant to someone who is not in a fire department, the chiefs will tell you that everything has to be taken out of the same budget. So the fewer dollars they have to spend on that, the more they have for other items that are important to the department.

Let's take a city like San Clemente, CA. Under proposition 9, they could not double their fire suppression system, and yet all of their fire suppression development was on the east side of the freeway. There were three entrances from the east side of the freeway to the west side.

The west side was developing. If they were going to properly protect the west side, let's say there was an earthquake or a tanker crash or something of that sort which denied them all three access points, they would have to have duplicate fire suppression facilities on the west side of the freeway, and they knew they were not going to get it.

So what they did was, they passed an ordinance in San Clemente saying no new construction, none whatsoever, not single family, multi-family, or commercial without quick response sprinkler heads being a regular part of the construction.

Now, the result is that because they can plan on making a 10-minute response, they do not need to double everything, including the pension provisions, which is a very real and necessary part of every fire department's budget, but also a very expensive one.

What this did was, it made the provision of fire protection to the west side of their community affordable, and that is really what we are headed for in the future, is to keep the present or an improved level of

fire protection without doubling the cost to the community because, quite frankly, the communities are not going to be able to afford it.

Mr. OSTROM. I think we have enough information. So, unless you have any last comments, the hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:28 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.

ADDITIONAL ARTICLES, LETTERS, AND STATEMENTS

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, February 19, 1986.

Hon. SLADE GORTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Science, Technology and Space, Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to express my deep concern about the President's fiscal 1987 budget proposals to abolish the U.S. Fire Administration (USFA) and to decrease by 23 percent funding for the National Fire Academy. In my view, these proposals would cause a serious and possibly disastrous set-back to our efforts in preventing and controlling loss of life and property due to fires.

As you know, the National Fire Academy in Emmitsburg, Maryland and the U.S. Fire Administration have contributed significantly to the dramatic reduction in loss of life due to fires. Through public education, arson prevention, technology development and firefighter training and outreach programs, fire deaths have declined 30 percent since our National fire program began in 1974.

However, there is no reason to believe that the National fire program has outlived its usefulness or is no longer needed. Fire continues to be a major problem in the United States. Nationally, some 8,000 people die and 300,000 more are injured in fires each year. The annual death toll is nearly 20 times the number of deaths caused by all the other kinds of natural disasters combined. The financial loss—$5 billion a year in property damage—is also straggering.

Congress has a serious responsibility to support and encourage a strong Federal fire prevention and control effort. We cannot abandon local firefighters as they try to deal with a problem of this magnitude. I urge you to ensure that funding is not reduced or eliminated for the U.S. Fire Administration and the National Fire Academy. Continued funding is a small price to pay for the tremendous service that these programs provide to our country.

I appreciate your cooperation in this matter and ask that my letter be made part of the record of your hearing on the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) budget.

With best regards,
Sincerely,

PAUL S. SARBANES,
U.S. Senator.

ALLIANCE OF AMERICAN INSURERS,
Washington, DC, March 3, 1986.

Hon. SLADE GORTON,
Subcommittee on Science, Technology and Space of the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Alliance of American Insurers is pleased to respond to your invitation to provide written testimony on how valuable the services and products offered by the National Fire Academy and the U.S. Fire Administration are to the insurance industry. We are pleased that our comments will be included in the February 20, 1986 hearing record for the reauthorization of the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

The Alliance of American Insurers is a national trade association with over 175 members that provide property insurance protection to all 50 states and the District of Columbia. The Alliance and its member companies have very serious concerns regarding the tremendous fire problem in the United States. As a national property and casualty trade association, the Alliance has always worked toward minimizing the fire hazard in the United States by helping to improve fire control methods.

We have attempted to list both general and specific benefits provided by the U.S. Fire Administration (USFA) and the National Fire Academy (NFA). Obviously, any improvement in fire service delivery and effectiveness has indirect benefits to the insurance industry through reduced claims experience. While the Alliance is interested in the property and casualty experience, the life and health claims should not be overlooked. (Our remarks are limited to property and casualty insurance industry.)

GENERAL BENEFITS

The USFA provides a single federal level focus on the nations fire problem. The fire service considers its statistical collection, programs, and training equivalent to that provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In 1984, the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) estimated that the direct property loss was over six billion dollars. This figure does not include funds paid for extra living expenses, death benefits, or medical expenses. Besides the fi-

nancial impact, over 5,000 were killed and 28,000 were injured in fires. For comparison in 1975 when the USFA was getting organized, the NFPA estimated that 11,800 were killed due to fire. This figure represents a death rate of approximately 55 people per one million population. If this rate continues, slightly more than 13,000 people should have died in fires during 1984. The U.S. Has roughly 8,000 additional citizens in 1984 alone at least partially due to the work of the USFA. How did this happen?

The USFA residential smoke detector research and installation campaign probably is the leading reason. The USFA funded research programs which proved the installation standards and effectiveness of residential smoke detection. Then they produced educational materials and programs for expounding the benefits. The insurance industry used these materials and has supported the installation of detectors. We doubt that this cause would be as advanced today without the USFA's leadership role.

Another USFA sponsored research program is beginning and we already have experienced over a handful of lives saved. In addition, the project's outgrowth is being used in the commercial fire protection area where the dollar savings from reduced fire loss, should be even higher. This program, to which we make reference, is the quick response residential sprinkler. While the NFPA had a special standard for the application of automatic sprinklers in the home, the research conducted by the USFA indicated the standard was not effective as written, using the technology available in the marketplace. Furthermore, there was no financial incentive to advance the technology. Even after the USFA's funding of the research, the Alliance understands that the market has yet to reach the point of recovering the product development costs. The product development costs were less because of the USFA's research.

SPECIFIC USFA PROJECTS BENEFITING THE INSURANCE INDUSTRY

1. National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS) provides a national estimate of fire causes and origins to help identify trends and where prevention efforts should be directed.
2. Arson Investigation Computer Software development.
3. Research in cooperation with the International Association of Fire Chiefs on rural arson and establishing an arson strike force.
4. Publishing, in cooperation with the American Bar Association, the Arson Reporter.
5. Educational efforts to reach our nations children. One of note is the cooperation with the Childrens Television Workshop to reach preschool and first through third grade children. Fire prevention education needs to start early to develop good habits.

SPECIFIC NFA PROJECTS BENEFITING THE INSURANCE INDUSTRY

1. Various arson investigation training class. Accurate determination of cause and origin is important to development of arson defense.
2. Hazardous materials incident response training. Prompt control and termination of accidental release minimize liability cost to the transporter.
3. Fire prevention officer and fire education specialist training. Qualified fire service people help the insurance industry with its loss prevention efforts. Local fire services have the advantage of more frequent contact to respond to changing conditions, and the ability to use stronger enforcement measures than are available to the insurance industry.
4. Courses on fire safe building design for architects and engineers. A version of this course would benefit insurance property underwriters and loss control personnel. Sound fire protection and life safety designs reduce loss exposure.

Mr. Chairman, we have not listed all of the USFA and NFA projects which help the industry. However, the ones indicated, in our opinion, probably have the greatest potential for reducing losses to the insurance industry. Reducing insurance industry losses reduces the cost of fire insurance to the public.

The Alliance has elected to support the Administration's program for reorganization and streamlining of government agencies making no special allowance for continuation of the operations of USFA. The Agency has done a good job, but we feel it is important to support the President's proposals.

We appreciate this opportunity to present our views and will be pleased to respond to questions.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. JONES, JR.,
Senior Washington Representative.

59-605 (56)

O